MOVING YHWH'S SANCTUARY: NOSTALGIA, DYSTOPIA, HETEROTOPIA,

AND THE FALL OF JERUSALEM IN EZEKIEL 8-11

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the

Claremont School of Theology

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Soo Jung Kim

May 2016

This dissertation completed by

Soo Jung Kim

has been presented to and accepted by the
faculty of Claremont School of Theology in
partial fulfillment of the requirements of the

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Faculty Committee

Marvin A. Sweeney, Chairperson

Jon L. Berquist

Carleen Mandolfo

Dean of the Faculty

Sheryl Kujawa-Holbrook

May 2016

ABSTRACT

MOVING YHWH'S SANCTUARY: NOSTALGIA, DYSTOPIA, HETEROTOPIA,
AND THE FALL OF JERUSALEM IN EZEKIEL 8-11

by

Soo Jung Kim

Claremont School of Theology

The book of Ezekiel is filled with the past memories of life in Jerusalem and the
future agenda of restoration in the land of Israel, rather than the present encounters with
Babylonian officials or other exiles in Chaldea. The temporal, spatial, and communicative
features of the book show that the book of Ezekiel is not much interested in "here and
now" matters, but is preoccupied with "there and before" or "there and later" matters.

The choice of using Ezekiel 8-11 in studying this peculiar phenomenon comes
from the recognition of the unique features of this vision, compared to the rest of the
book of Ezekiel. Ezekiel 8-11 deals with those "there and before" and "there and after"
matters as a "here and now" broadcast manner by vividly depicting the Jerusalem temple
in the vision. It is also this first temple vision in which Ezekiel the priest stands between
his people and his deity. The book of Ezekiel seriously asks where YHWH's sanctuary
shall go if the first chosen place, Jerusalem, has been proved inappropriate. This "moving
YHWH's Sanctuary" is, in my reading, a driving motif of the plot development and a key
to opening every room in the book of Ezekiel, and Ezekiel 8-11 shows this momentous
transition of YHWH's moving his sanctuary.

Review of past scholarship reveals that in-depth investigation on this topic still
needs to come. To appreciate the multi-dimensional presentations of the text, this study

employs various approaches including advanced form criticism, spatial theories, memory theories, intertextual readings, and narrative studies. Thematically, the present study will pursue the temporal, spatial, and communicative aspects of Ezekiel 8-11 to appreciate the theological agonies and proposals of the book of Ezekiel. Methodologically, this study has two aims: the first goal lies in making a balance between "what" and "how" questions while reading Ezekiel 8-11; the second goal is to propose a paradigm which we can apply to our lives now. Accordingly, this study will pay equal attention to the very detailed and subtle matters as well as the macro-thematic questions while reading the text to answer the "what" and "how" questions as well as the "so-what for us" questions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

perform what we understand as a Christian. I am also indebted to Dr. Mandolfo, who taught me the cinematic dimensions of the biblical narrative and various intertextual and narrative concepts and practices. She has often advised me to think of how I can lead my readers, because writing is a form of communication. Indeed, I believe her advice became the roots of my interest in discourse analysis study.

This dissertation would not have been possible without all three of my committee members advising me. It was my privilege that I could serve as a Research Assistant and a Teaching Assistant for all three committee members.

It was blessing for me to study with and get advice from many prominent scholars. It has been always a pleasure to converse with President Jeffrey Kuan about various topics of Hebrew Bible, Asian perspectives on biblical studies, ANE related discoveries, and the CST community. Meetings with Emeritus Professor Rolf Knieirm as a Research Assistant was also a blessing to me. I learned greatly from his broad and deep knowledge on the Bible. Prof. Tammi Schneider helped me even before I started my doctoral study at CST. It was she who encouraged me to compare the structure and the shape of Mesopotamian cities with Jerusalem. Meeting with Dr. Jenny Rose also opened my eyes on the ancient and modern Persian Empire, religion, and cultures. Dr. Kristin De Troyer and Dr. Tamar C. Eskenazi taught me in their Ezra-Nehemiah classes respectively and shaped my understanding of the postexilic community in the Bible. I also express my thanks to the CST library staff members including Dr. Tom Phillips, Dr. Mark Bilby, and Ms Elaine Walker for their generous provisions for my research. My gratitude continues on my former teachers at Calvin Theological Seminary in Grand Rapids, Michigan, including Prof. Carl Bosma, Prof. Michael Williams, Prof. Arie Leder, and Prof. Won

Lee. Thanks to their teachings, I was able to lay the foundation of the close synchronic reading of the biblical text before coming to CST.

I would express many thanks to my colleagues at several institutions where I have been teaching as an adjunct faculty member. At Azusa Pacific University, I give thanks to Dr. Robert Duke, Dr. William Yarchin, Dr. Timothy Finlay, Dr. Kay H. Smith, Dr. Karen Winslow, and Dr. Kirsten S. Oh, and also to my APU and APS students from 2013 to the present. At Evangelia University, many thanks go to late President Dr. Kun S. Lee, President Dr. Hyun K. Shin, and Dr. Soo Young Lee. My deep gratitude surely goes to my former professor Rev. Dr. Chahi Won at Evangelia University, who recognized my potentiality, taught the passion, and encouraged my way during my academic journey since 2000. At Presbyterian Theological Seminary, President Sang Meyng Lee and I exchanged many interesting topics in the Old and New Testaments. Dialogues with all of these faculty members have given me insights and assurance.

My sincere thanks also go to friends at Theological Perspectives of the Book of Ezekiel at SBL National Meeting, including Dr. Stephen L. Cook, Dr. Dalit Rom-Shiloni, Dr. Steven S. Tuell, Dr. Madhavi Nevader, Dr. Michael Lyon, and Dr. Casey Strine. From 2012 to the present, they have supported me by listening, challenging, and advising the various topics of my dissertation when we saw each other at the SBL National/International Meetings. Dr. Richard Weis, Dr. John Hull, and Dr. Serge Frolov are also good friends at SBL meetings who have shared abundant fruits of their studies.

Throughout my doctoral studies, I have had many thankful Hebrew Bible colleagues at Claremont School of Theology, including Hye Kyung Park, Shelley Long, Koog P. Hong, Emmanuel Onuoha, Gavrielle Blank, Caroline Peterson, Nancy Meyer,

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	Anchor Bible Dictionary
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANET	Ancient Near Eastern Texts
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
ATSAT	Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BHQ	Biblia Hebraica Quinta
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
BibOr	Biblica et Orientalia
BiOr	*Bibliotheca Orientalis*
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBR	*Currents in Biblical Research*
EBR	*Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception*
ETS	Evangelical Theological Society
ETSMS	Evangelical Theological Society Monograph Series
EvTh	*Evangelische Theologie*

FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
Int	*Interpretation*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JHebS	*Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*
JHS	*The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*
JPS	Jewish Publication Society
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of the Jewish Studies*
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of the Jewish Studies: Supplement Series
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
LHB/OTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/ Old Testament Studies
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text, as represented by *Codex Leningradensis*
NCB	New Century Bible Commentary
NIB	New Interpreter's Bible

NICOT   *New International Commentary on the Old Testament*

NKZ   *Neue Kirchilche Zeitschrift*

OBO   Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis

OTL   Old Testament Library

PMLA   *Publications of the Modern Language Association*

RHPR   *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses*

SBL   Society of Biblical Literature

SBLABS   Society of Biblical Literature Archeology and Biblical Studies

SBLDS   Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series

SHBC   Smyth and Helwys Bible Commentary

SJOT   *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*

SOTS   Society for Old Testament Study

TQ   *Theologische Quartalschrift*

TZ   *Theologische Zeitschrift*

VT   *Vetus Testamentum*

VTSup   Vetus Testament: : Supplement Series

WBC   Word Biblical Commentary

ZAW   Zeitschrift fur die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

CONTENTS

Part I Laying "Flexible" Foundations

> The future is only an indifferent void no one cares about, but the past is filled with life, and its countenance is irritating, repellent, wounding, to the point that we want to destroy or repaint it. We want to be masters of the future only for the power to change the past.[1]

In Milan Kundera's novel *The Book of Laughter and Forgetting*, the narrator tells us a

surprising truth of the past, present, and future. For Kundera's characters, and maybe for us, too,

the past is crucial for the present and for the future. As Gerard A. Hauser interprets, people may

spend their time and energy recounting the narrative of the past for the future.[2] A Hebrew Bible

scholar Ehud Ben Zvi also interprets the world of the prophetic books in terms of the past,

present, and future:

> Prophetic books construed memories of a shared past, primarily the monarchic past and its immediate aftermath. By so doing, they contributed to social cohesion and a sense of self-identity among the re-readers since the past was about "them." Remembered past is recreated past; it is a "present" past.[3]

This is the common impression that I have gotten from my readings of the book of

Ezekiel and of Kundera's novel.

The book of Ezekiel, the sacred prophetic literature for both Jewish and Christian

traditions, presents various voices through the eyes of an exiled priest-prophet. Strangely enough,

however, when we look for the vivid pictures of the Babylonian exilic community, we are

surprised at its indifference at depiction of the lives of the exiles in Babylon. How much can we

---

[1] Milan Kundera, *The Book of Laughter and Forgetting*, trans. Aaron Asher (New York: Perennial Classics, 1999), 30.

[2] Gerard A. Hauser, *Introduction to Rhetorical Theory: Second Edition* (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2012), 272.

[3] Ehud Ben Zvi, "The Concept of Prophetic Books," in *The Production of Prophecy: Constructing Prophecy and Prophets in Yehud*, ed. Diana Vikander Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi (New York: Equinox, 2009), 75.

know of the life of the exilic community through the book of Ezekiel? Do we know of the social structure that the exiles encountered? Do we know their economic situations? How about the hierarchical differences according to the nationalities of the captives? Do we know then their religious beliefs and practices? We have very rare and, if any, refracted glance at the audience's life through other characters' mouths. This frustrating impression is reasonable since prophetic presentations and the vision accounts, which consist of most portions of the book, were originated from YHWH's initiatives and showed therefore his perspective. By the omniscient character YHWH, the portrayal of the audience—both the Jerusalemites and the exilic community— is those who are harshly criticized by the omniscient character YHWH rather than received some compassion or consolation. Despite prophet's frequent calls to repent, and despite several geographical names of Babylonia, the book appears escaping from the immediate praxis but projecting something else at some other time and place. There is no report that one changed her attitude after listening to the prophetic speeches from Ezekiel.

The book of Ezekiel is indeed filled with the past memories and the future agenda, rather than the present encounters. In a religious mind, city is a dwelling place of human beings while temple is a dwelling place of their deity. In between is priest standing as mediator. But, when the citizens were smitten by their guardian deity, when the temple was abandoned by the divine builder, and when the priest could not stand up as mediator but was thrown into a polluted foreign land with his fellow exiles, what would come from the pen of that priest? How will Ezekiel the priest-prophet, in the midst of the most desperate crisis, unpack the ideal relationship between the human being's dwelling place and the deity's dwelling place in his agenda? The present study starts from this question, and finds answers from the observation of the unique

presentations in the first temple vision account, Ezekiel 8-11.[4]

---

[4] In naming Ezekiel 8-11, I choose the term "the first temple" instead of "the Jerusalem temple" from the consideration of the final vision. When we scrutinize Ezekiel 40-48, it would be hard to say that the new temple in the final vision (chs. 40-48) is built at the completely different location from the same spot of old city Jerusalem. In other words, one should not distinguish the first and the final temple vision as "Jerusalem temple vision" and "the temple vision in some other place" although the name "Jerusalem" does not appear in the final vision. For the naming of Ezekiel 8-11 as the first temple vision, see also John T. Strong, "Grounding Ezekiel's Heavenly Ascent: A Defense of Ezek 40-48," *SJOT* 26, no. 2 (2021): 192-211.

CHAPTER 1 Introduction

1.1 Why Ezekiel 8-11?

Let me reiterate my observation now with some modifications: "The book of Ezekiel is indeed filled with the past memories *of the life in Jerusalem* and the future agenda *of restoration in the land of Israel*, rather than present encounters *with the Babylonian officials or with the exiles in Chaldea*." While my first statement tells about the conspicuity of the temporal tendency of the book, this modified statement brings several other concerns, too, including spatial and communicative matters.

Spatially, Babylon or Tel Abib as the physical location of the characters (Ben Adam and the captives) is almost completely ignored. Even when their living place is depicted, it is rather theologically introduced as a wilderness-like concept or as a very abstract space, rather than as the land of bondage as we know of Egypt in Exodus, Babylon in Daniel, or Persia in Esther. How shall we interpret this phenomenon that the book of Ezekiel avoids depicting Babylon but is preoccupied with the happenings in Jerusalem? In terms of communication, the literary audience of the character-narrator Ben Adam seems not so intimately connected to their prophet Ezekiel. The rate of the reports of the deliverance of the prophetic speeches is less than 10 %, only 3 times out of more than 40 times of the divine commands to prophesy.[5] Moreover, readers do not see any re-presentation of the content of the prophecy or the reaction from the audience even in these three times of prophecy-fulfilment report.[6] In sum, temporal, spatial, and communicative

---

[5] Those three reports appear in 11:25 (Ezekiel's brief report on the first temple vision to the "exiles"); 12:7 (report on Ezekiel's performance of moving); and 24:18-20 (short dialogue between Ezekiel and "people" concerning the death of his wife and Ezekiel's strange custom).

[6] When we think of the Pentateuchal narratives, and of the book of Jeremiah, the uniqueness of the book of Ezekiel becomes clearer. For example, the book of Exodus focuses on

features of the book tell that the book of Ezekiel is not much interested in "here and now" matters. With these observations, we pause to ask: shall we follow Volkmar Herntrich or James Smith[7] who argued that the book of Ezekiel was composed by a prophet who never left Jerusalem? My answer is no. We should not hastily conclude that the lack of the present sense proves the discrepancies between the literary presentation date and place of the book and the historical backgrounds of the compositional date and place, i.e. those discrepancies were the result of the late composition in the name of Ezekiel. A serious reader of the book of Ezekiel should ask what would be the overall intention of the present text. With these prevalent indeterminacies and otherness, and with the fantastic genre and self-declarative monologue like prophecies, what message(s) would the book of Ezekiel attempt to deliver?

In this context, Ezekiel 8-11 draws my special attention. The choice of using the first temple vision in studying this peculiar phenomenon comes from the recognition of the unique features of this vision, compared to the rest of the book of Ezekiel. Ezekiel 8-11 deals with those "there and before" and "there and after" matters as a "here and now" broadcast manner by vividly depicting the Jerusalem temple. At the same time, its genre as vision account and its location as Jerusalem constantly remind us that this vision account also follows the overall tendency of the book, i.e. "there and before" or "there and later." It is also this first temple vision in which Ben Adam most actively reacts to the current events as mediator by lamenting to

---

broadcasting Moses' reiterations of the divine commands to Pharaoh and the people of Israel, and their reactions. In many cases, the book of Jeremiah appears to use the opposite strategy to the strategy of the book of Ezekiel, which reserves the content of the divine commands until the narrator can show Jeremiah's delivery moments. On the contrary, the book of Ezekiel shows the rhetorical strategy of the repetition only in the divine commands from YHWH. As I will deal in the discourse analysis section, this tendency produces the different experiences between the reader and the literary audience.

[7] Volkmar Herntrich, *Ezechielprobleme*, BZAW 61 (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1932), 37-45, 127-30; James Smith, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: A New Introduction* (New York: Macmillan, 1931), 15-21.

YHWH. Here in Ezekiel 8-11, Ezekiel the priest stands between his people and his deity.

Unfortunately, however, rather than being able to rescue his city, temple, and people from the

wrath of YHWH, this exiled priest-prophet receives a very new mission: breaking the memory of

Jerusalem that his audience wants to keep; breaking the hope of instant return that his audience

wants to keep; and breaking the innocent self-identity that his audience wants to keep. The

outcome of the new mission will be great, but the book ends before Ezekiel's vision comes true.

Nonetheless, in my reading, Ben Adam accomplished his priestly-prophetic duties very well in a

new context. As a priest and a prophet, Ben Adam accompanies when YHWH moves away his

sanctuary from Jerusalem (Ezekiel 8-11); he lives as a symbolic scroll or as a sanctuary bearer by

swallowing the scroll that YHWH gave him (Ezekiel 1-3); and becomes the only witness in

vision by accompanying the Bronze Man when the glory of the God of Israel comes back to the

new temple (Ezekiel 40-48). But, beginning of this wonderful project should start from breaking

the tenacious memory of the people, even blowing out their nostalgia, and from making

Jerusalem a dystopia. By claiming the translocation of YHWH's sanctuary from Jerusalem to the

place of the *golah* community in Chaldea, Ezekiel 8-11 starts showing the complete rejection of

the old hope in a very radical way. No other passage in the book of Ezekiel can beat Ezekiel 8-11

on this severe cut-off project.

Those phenomena naturally touch our theological curiosities, too. By showing this

translocation of YHWH's throne (sanctuary) in a very awesome and dreadful manner, Ezekiel 8-

11 serves that the book of Ezekiel is able to demonstrate a unique theological way on the matter

of hiddenness of God among the exilic prophetic literature. At least, in the book of Ezekiel,

readers know what YHWH is doing during the exilic time. YHWH in the book of Ezekiel was

not like the God in the book of Isaiah, who mysteriously disappeared in people's suffering time

and in the nation's disaster but suddenly came back to his former wife, Zion.[8] Ezekiel's YHWH constantly talks to Ezekiel, mostly condemns the house of Israel, and always commands his prophet to deliver his messages. In sum, the God of the book of Ezekiel shows his solemn and volunteer decision to move his dwelling place from his first chosen place, Jerusalem. Ezekiel 8-11 is the dramatic vision narrative to capture this moment.

In reaching this conclusion, I have set several driving questions which are closely related to my methodologies for this study. Questions on its structure, genre, and settings are all related to the form critical analysis. As the title of my study shows, this study also seeks the spatial dimensions of the text. And for the communication matter in the text, I also engage with questions from the discourse analysis and narratology.

1. Let us begin with the literary context of Ezekiel 8-11. Can we find any significant pattern between chapters 4-7 as the previous unit of Ezekiel 8-11 and chapter 12 as its subsequent unit? How does the book of Ezekiel relate the prophetic presentations and the first temple vision in its formal structure?

2. How much can we find the parallels between the Jerusalem temple in Ezekiel 8 and the one in the book of Kings? With whose era can we most match the pictures? Is the temple picture of Ezekiel 8 close to Zedekiah's time? Josiah's time? Or Hezekiah's? How about times of Ahaz and Manasseh?

3. What would be the ultimate goal of making Jerusalem a dystopia? How would it work for the *golah* community, the literary and implied audience of Ben Adam the narrator?

4. How shall we understand the structure of Ezekiel 9, 10, and 11? If those three chapters show the multiple presentations on the divine executions, for what effect is the text so concentrated on presenting the destruction of the city and the defilement of the temple?

5. What shall we learn from the scene of the elders sitting before Ezekiel the priest-prophet? Is there any social setting (*Sitz im Leben*) that we can connect?

---

[8] For example, see Isaiah 1:15; 50:2; 52:5; 54:8; and 57:17.

6. What is the meaning of YHWH's proclamation to become himself a "sanctuary" to the exilic community in Ezek. 11:16? How effectively does the concept of moving YHWH's sanctuary work in the book of Ezekiel? How could it be possible that the holy God of Israel dwell in the polluted foreign land?

7. How shall we understand the shift of YHWH's attitude towards the elders of Judah in the *golah* community from the first temple vision (Ezekiel 8-11) to the subsequent prophecies in Ezekiel 14 and 20? What does the omniscient character YHWH see from the elders while readers cannot know anything? Why does the harsh criticism which YHWH poured to the Jerusalemites in Ezekiel 8-11 move to the elders of the *golah* community?

8. Why, "there and before," and "there and later," instead of "here and now with you"?

9. How shall our reading attitude affect our understanding of the text, if we keep in mind that we read Ezekiel 8-11, the vision report/fantasy, not the historical narrative? How shall we explain this irony that readers see the most active scene of the book in this vision account? And how shall we understand the other worldliness of the vision which reveals the secret of the inaccessible space?

10. Finally, to what degree, can we apply the term Heterotopia in reading the presentations in Ezekiel 8-11 and more generally in the book of Ezekiel?

Thematically, the present study will pursue the temporal, spatial, and communicative aspects of Ezekiel 8-11 to appreciate the theological agonies and proposals of the book of Ezekiel. Methodologically, this study has two aims: the first goal lies in making balance of "what" and "how" questions in reading Ezekiel 8-11; from the outcome of the first aim, ultimately this study will propose a paradigm which we can apply to our lives now. Accordingly, this study will equally pay attention to the very detailed and subtle matters on reading the text to answer "what" and "how" questions as well as to the macro-thematic questions to answer "so-what for us" questions. Some of my questions are not new, but the synthesis of those questions in an attempt to understand the multi-dimensional textual intentions of Ezekiel 8-11, in my knowledge, has not

yet reached the fruitful-enough conclusions. History of interpretations in the following section

will prove this.

1.2 History of interpretations on the Book of Ezekiel: Shifts of the Research Trends

       1.2.1 Diachronic Quests[9]

Unlike other classical prophetic books including the book of Isaiah or the book of

Jeremiah, the book of Ezekiel experiences the issue of its canonicity. Unlike other books such as

Esther, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Solomon, however, the real issue of the book lies in

the use of the book in the public reading in the liturgical settings. The attempt of prohibition of

the book's public reading due to the contradictions to the Torah is recorded in the Talmud b. Hag.

1:13a. The episode of Hananiah ben Hezekiah has now become a famous legendary story in

which Hananiah ben Hezekiah burned 300 jars of oil to solve the contradictions between the

Torah and the book of Ezekiel, especially the portion of chapters 40-48.

Such critical perspectives on the book of Ezekiel continued through centuries.[10] In the

early 20th century, rejecting the one author assumption, Johannes Hermann argued that the book

---

[9] In this discussion, "synchronic" reflects the perspective of readers' holistic view on the present text while "diachronic" refers to the attempt to trace the development of the text up to the present form through times. For discussions of the diachronic and synchronic terms, from their origins from Saussure's linguistic terms and the application on the book of Ezekiel in particular, see Paul M. Joyce, "Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives on Ezekiel," in *Synchronic or Diachronic?: A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis*, ed. Johannes Cornelis De Moor, SOTS (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 115- 28.

[10] In the mid-17th century, scholars pointed out the book's difficulty and darkness. A few examples are: in the 17th century, Benedict Spinoza's suggestion of lost and corruption of the text and William Greenhill's pointing to the difficulty and darkness of the book in his exposition of the book; in the 18th century, G. L. Oeder's suggestion of disapproval of chapters 40-48 due to a second hand writer; in the 19th century, Leopold Zunz's late composition date of 400 B.C. as a fiction. For the reviews up to the 20th century in detail, see William Greenhill, *An Exposition of the Prophet Ezekiel, with Useful Observations Thereupon* (London: Samuel Holdsworth, 1839); Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24*, trans. Ronald E. Clements, eds. Frank Moore Cross and Klaus Baltzer with the assistance of

of Ezekiel is a mere collection of prophecies.[11] His initial study governed the Ezekiel scholarship until the mid-20th century. Rise of traditio-historical criticism and redaction criticism encouraged investigating the multiple editing layers behind the present form. The main challenge of the 20th century began with the observation by Gustav Hölscher, who argued that the genuine prophet's passages are limited in his poetic passages, in 170 verses total. Hölscher attributed most prose sections to secondary priestly hands. According to Hölscher, 5th century priestly redactors completely changed the shape of the book by transforming the prophetic originality into ritual and legalistic materials.[12] Several distinct criteria have been suggested through years, including priestly or Deuteronomistic vocabularies, textual critical apparatus as different witnesses, etc.[13] As we shall see in more detail when the issues come up, those conclusions were not much objective and fair evaluations, but governed by interpreters' subjective presuppositions in the name of critical scientific way of reading. In other words, now we need to overcome our own presuppositions and should be able to seriously review the assumption of priesthood and prophetic ministry as incompatible offices.[14] By the same token, in the reconstruction of the text according to the affiliated sources or traditions, interpreters must always be aware that authors

---

Leonard Jay Greenspoon (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 1-80; Daniel I. Block, *Ezekiel 1-24*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 9-17.

[11] Johannes Hermann, *Ezechielstudien* (Leipzig: Keichert, 1908).

[12] Gustav Hölscher, *Hesekiel, der Dichter und das Buch: eine literarkritische Untersuchung*, BZAW 39 (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1924).

[13] Cf. Johan Lust, "The Final Text and Textual Criticism: Ez 39,28," in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and their Interrelation*, 48-54.

[14] Marvin Sweeney challenges this dichotomistic view and argues that interpreters should view the priestly identity and prophetic calling of Ezekiel simultaneously in the book of Ezekiel. See, Marvin A. Sweeney, "Ezekiel: Zadokite Priest and Visionary Prophet of the Exile," in *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2005), 125-43. Also see Terry J. Betts, *Ezekiel the Priest: A custodian of Tôrâ* (New York: Peter Lang, 2005), especially chapter 3, Ezekiel the Priest, 47-88.

and editors of the text were the very creative and even innovative literates as well as faithful preservers of their traditions.

Diachronic quests continued after Hölscher's study. Like Walther Eichrodt, who attempted to separate collections between the later additions and the original work,[15] Jörg Garscha also paid attention to the extreme chasm between the editors' theologies and the prophetic claims throughout the book of Ezekiel. Garscha approved only 30 or more verses, such as the two eagles' story in chapter 17, as a primary material. Garscha even used the term "Deutero-Ezekiel," which includes the sacral law stratum, to identify his discernment of layers in around 300 through 200 B.C.E.[16]

Challenge of the compositional date of the book also continued. Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann argued that most portions of the book must be a product of the Persian period, even if the editing work would have begun in the late monarchic period.[17] Charles Cutler Torrey went further, arguing that the prophet was actually not a historical character but an imagined character who was supposed to live during the reign of Manasseh while the redactor probably lived in ca. 200 B.C.E.[18] Unfortunately, many of their dissecting approaches might come from their unbalanced

---

[15] Walther Eichrodt, *Ezekiel: A Commentary*, trans. Cosslett Quinn from German volume *Der Prophet Hessekiel,* Das Alte Testament Deutsch 22/1-2, 1965-1966, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970).

[16] Jörg Garscha, *Studien zum Ezechielbuch. Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung von 1-39*, (Frankfurt am Mein: Herbert Lang, 1974). For a more detailed review on the redactional discussion, see Anja Klein, *Schriftauslegung im Ezechielbuch. Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Ez 34-39* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).

[17] Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann, *Ezechielstudien. Zur redaktionsgeschichte des Buches und zur Frage nach den ältesten Texten* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992).

[18] Charles Cutler Torrey, *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy*, Yale Oriented Series 18 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), 98-101. Carl G. Howie attributes the authorship differently, arguing that chs. 1-24 and 25-32 were the work of a scribe-disciple; chs. 34-39 by a disciple of Ezekiel after the death of Ezekiel. Nonetheless, he attributes chs. 40-48 to

presupposition that the prophet and priest are never harmonious in essence, and/or from the view that the ancient redactors are not so creative but very mechanical in their editions. In other words, the key questions or the criteria of the diachronic approach have too much depended on the subjective presupposition that we can straightforwardly match the phenomena of the text with the socio-historical settings of the presumed times.

There have been, however, different responses on this challenge within the diachronic discussion. With the traditio-historical, form-critical, and redaction-critical methodologies, Walther Zimmerli respected the prophet's authorship in his study, arguing that a substantial amount of the original oral speeches were composed and edited almost simultaneously by the prophet himself as post-event records. By attributing remaining portions to Ezekiel's disciples/schools under the supervision of Ezekiel himself or not long after the death of the prophet, Zimmerli asserted the possibility of the coherent authorship as well as the consistent theological views.[19] He named this particular phenomenon as text's post-history, i.e., prolongation (*Fortschreibung*), through the Ezekiel school. Thus, despite the possible long-term tradition in compositional history, the present form of the text can keep the apparent homogeneity.[20] This agenda was later challenged by Ellen F. Davis' proposal of the reversal order in the final form analysis, i.e., the written script first, then the oral performance later as a script reading.[21]

---

an anonymous author as an independent circulation for a certain time. Carl G. Howie, *The Date and Composition of Ezekiel*, SBLMS 4 (Philadelphia: SBL, 1950).

[19] Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 71. According to his observation, 50 independent self-contained units in the book of Ezekiel are correspondent with the individual unit of the oral transmission.

[20] Zimmerli, *The Fiery Throne: The Prophets and Old Testament Theology*, Fortress Classics in Biblical Studies (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2003).

[21] Ellen F. Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll: Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel's Prophecy*, JSOTSup 78, Bible and Literature Series 213 (Sheffield: Almond Press,

1.2.2 Interests in the Synchronic Setting

Indeed, Davis' somewhat innovative position stands in the line of Moshe Greenberg, who is known for his "holistic" approach to stress the great unity of the text.[22] Greenberg's emphasis falls on the argument of the "one time" composition with little editorial work. Accordingly, despite his great efforts and contributions from the literary analysis of the final form of the book of Ezekiel, Greenberg's light treatment on the explicit seams in the text causes his study to have weak spots. As we shall see in the review of form criticism, advanced form critical methodology would overcome this conscious ignorance of the textual growth as well as hasty severance of the text by somewhat subjective diachronic reconstructions.

The shift from the dominant diachronic approach to the synchronic approach to the book of Ezekiel should be also attributed to the advanced archeological researches and discoveries. For example, the destruction of the Judean cities has been confirmed by the evidence of inscriptions and potteries. The Lachish Ostraca provides a possible picture of the siege of the city described in Ezekiel 4:1-3. Georg Fohrer's conviction of the authentic Ezekiel and the Babylonian setting in his 1952 work might be the fruit of this discovery.[23] The existence of the

---

1989). Indeed, this position already appeared in Gunkel's study when he described Ezekiel as the first prophet who wrote a book. Herman Gunkel, "Die Israelitische Literatur," in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, ed. Paul Hinneberg (Berlin & Leipzig, 1906), 90.

[22] Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20* (New York: Anchor Bible, 1983); idem, "Vision of Jerusalem in Ezekiel 8-11: A Holistic Interpretation," in *The Divine Helmsman: Studies on God's Control of Human Events, Fest. Lou H. Silberman*, ed. J. L. Crenshaw and S. Sandmel (New York: Ktav, 1980), 143-64; idem, *Ezekiel 21-37* (New York: Anchor Bible, 1997); Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll.* Keith W. Carley also pays attention to this unique position of the book of Ezekiel among other prophetic books in Hebrew Bible. Keith W. Carley, *Ezekiel among the Prophets: A Study of Ezekiel's Place in Prophetic Tradition*, Studies in Biblical Theology 31 (Naperville: A. R. Allenson, 1975).

[23] Georg Fohrer, *Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel*, BZAW 72 (Berlin, Alfred Töpelmann, 1952).

name "Yaukin King of Judah" and skilled workers in the Babylonian captive list also give some historicity to the book of Ezekiel.[24]

Paul Joyce's and Daniel Block's works stand essentially on the same line as this holistic reading, though they did not restrict their works in the same sense of Greenberg's approach.[25] In discussion of diachronic and synchronic understanding of the book of Ezekiel, Joyce suggests interesting advice:

> This book has proved notoriously resistant to any straightforward division between primary and secondary material. The particular complexity of questions of unity and authorship in the book of Ezekiel is owed especially to the marked homogeneity of the Ezekiel tradition, in which secondary material (even where it can be identified) bears an unusually close 'family resemblance' to primary.[26]

As we have seen, while the early and mid- 20th century tendency in Ezekiel scholarship showed strong diachronic approaches, the late-20th century scholarship has produced various studies from the synchronic approaches based on literary, rhetorical, and theological analyses. Lawrence Boadt's literary and philological study, Gordon H. Matties's eclectic approach, Jacqueline Lapsley's ideological analysis, Thomas Renz's study of the rhetoric, and Tyler Mayfield's literary structure and setting analysis are some fruits of this tendency.[27] This shift is

---

[24] William F. Albright, *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra*, Torchbooks 102 (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 87.

[25] Paul Joyce, *Ezekiel: A Commentary*, LHB/OTS 482 (New York/London: T & T Clark, 2007); Block, *Ezekiel 1-24*.

[26] Joyce, "Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives on Ezekiel," 118.

[27] Lawrence Boadt, *Ezekiel's Oracles against Egypt: A Literary and Philological Study of Ezekiel 29-32*, BibOr 37 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980); Gordon H. Matties, *Ezekiel 18 and the Rhetoric of Moral Discourse*, SBLDS 126 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990); Jacqueline Lapsley, *Can These Bones Live: The Problem of the Moral Self in the Book of Ezekiel*, BZAW 301 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000); Thomas Renz, *The Rhetorical Function of the book of Ezekiel,* VTSup 76 (Leiden: Brill, 2002); Tyler D. Mayfield, *Literary Structure and Setting in Ezekiel*, FAT 2. 43 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

not limited to the study of the book of Ezekiel but is the result of the general shift on the biblical literature studies.

These late 20th to early 21st century interpreters usually take a middle position that the actual historical development of the book must be the mixture of the original composition and the later editorial works. For example, Leslie Allen employs both literary-critical approach and the historical-critical approach.[28] Ronald Clements also emphasizes short-term composition of the book of Ezekiel as "no more than two generations."[29] Rise of composition criticism in the mid-20th century may encourage scholars to consider this middle position, too. As John H. Sailhamer argues, this criticism seeks the compositional strategy of the text by paying attention to "the semantics of the arrangement of source material" in the text.[30]

1.2.3 Comparison with the ANE literature

Considerations of the ancient Near East literature, especially the Babylonian cultural influence on the book of Ezekiel, have enhanced the understanding of the book.[31] Daniel Bodi's

---

[28] Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, WBC 29 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990).

[29] Ronald. E. Clements, "The Chronology of Redaction in Ez 1-24," in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*, 294.

[30] John H. Sailhamer, *Introduction to Old Testament Theology: A Canonical Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 272. Also see the earlier seed study in Georg Fohrer, Hans Werner Hoffmann, Friedrich Huber, Ludwig Markert, and Gunther Wanke, *Exegese des Alten Testaments: Einführung in die Methodik*, 5th edition, UTB 267 (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1983).

[31] Several examples of the considerable works include: Daniel Block, "Divine Abandonment: Ezekiel's Adaptation of an Ancient Near Eastern Motif," in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological And Anthropological Perspectives*, ed. M. S. Odell and J. T. Strong, SBLSymS. 9 (Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 15-42; Christoph Uehlinger and Susanne Muller Trufaut, "Ezekiel 1, Babylonian Cosmological Scholarship and Iconography: Attempts at Further Refinement," *TZ* 57 (2001): 140-71; Brian N. Peterson, *Ezekiel in Context: Ezekiel's Message Understood in Its Historical Setting of Covenant Curses and Ancient Near Eastern Mythological Motifs*, Princeton Theological Monograph series 182 (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012). Recently *Die Welt des Orients* 45, no. 1 (July, 2015) published substantial studies of the book of Ezekiel with the ANE

comparison of the departure of the glory of YHWH with the ANE ritual presented in the poem *Erra and Ishum* opens a broader spectrum in understanding the phenomenon of the deity's abandonment of his or her city.[32] Margaret Odell's commentary, in which she investigates various presentations of the book with the Babylonian inscriptions of Esarhaddon, should also draw our attention.[33] Recently, Donna Lee Petter suggests a new agenda. Using Dobbs-Allsopp's lament study, Petter examines potential connections between the Mesopotamian City Laments and the book of Ezekiel in terms of their generic features.[34] As Carleen Mandolfo points out, the primary function of Mesopotamian City Laments lies in the restoration of the abandoned city, and it is one of the common elements to share with the book of Ezekiel.[35] However, the comparative study with other culturally oriented literature always needs to be done carefully. As advanced form criticism warns, a strong desire to apply one-on-one matching between two separate texts may make the uniqueness of each text blur. This mechanical

---

comparison, especially in the Babylonian contexts: Shawn Zelig Aster, "Ezekiel's Adaptation of Mesopotamian Melammu"; Daniel Bodi, "The Double Current and the Tree of Healing in Ezekiel 47:1-12 in Light of Babylonian Iconography and Texts"; Dale Launderville, "The Threat of Syncretism to Ezekiel's Exilic Audience in the Dry Bones Passage"; Christoph Uehlinger, "Virtual Vision vs. Actual Show: Strategies of Visualization in the Book of Ezekiel"; and Martti Nissinen, "(How) Does the Book of Ezekiel Reveal Its Babylonian Context?" are noteworthy.

[32] Daniel Bodi, *The Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra*, OBO 104 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991); idem, "The Double Current and the Tree of Healing in Ezekiel 47:1-12) in Light of Babylonian Iconography and Texts," *Die Welt des Orients* 45, no. 1 (2015): 22-37.

[33] Margaret S. Odell, "Genre and Persona in Ezekiel 24:15-24," in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*, 195-219.

[34] Donna Lee Petter, *The Book of Ezekiel and Mesopotamian City Laments*, OBO 246 (Fribourg: Academic Press, 2011).

[35] Carleen Mandolfo, "Dialogic Form Criticism," in *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies*, ed. Roland Boer (Atlanta: SBL, 2007), 77.

understanding of genre and its application which I saw in Petter's work[36] may make us repeat

the earlier scholars' limitation, in which sometimes they used comparisons to impose their

agendas upon the text.

Meanwhile, Daniel Block's *Gods of the Nations* shows similarities among the ANE

literature about how gods relate to their people and their land.[37] John Kutsko's comparison has a

somewhat unique feature to metaphorically connect human images and the image of god for the

polemics against idol worships. With the comparison between the book of Ezekiel and idol

spoliation and the mouth opening ritual, practiced in Assyria and Babylonia, Kutsko's study

helps us understand Ezekiel's sign-acts, including his dumbness and eating of the scroll.[38]

Finally, Stephen Cook's philological comparison between Ugarit *šbʻ* and Hebrew *śbʻ* of

Ezekiel 38-39 gives us another insight. In his Ugaritic myth study, Cook suggests the possibility

of Ezekiel's adaptation of the Ugaritic divine-warrior myth, especially Anat's unsatisfied anger,

to express "the image of becoming glutted and drunk on the fat and blood of the slain enemy

(Ezek. 39:19-20)."[39]

---

[36] As I will analyze later in detail, Petter interprets most behaviors of Ezekiel as the mourning ritual to evoke his audience or to practice as a representative of the fallen city.

[37] Daniel I. Block, *Gods of the Nations: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern National Theology,* ETSMS 2 (Jackson: ETS, 1988).

[38] John F. Kutsko, *Between Heaven and Earth: Divine Presence and Absence in the Book of Ezekiel*, Biblical and Judaic Studies from UC San Diego 7 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000).

[39] Stephen L. Cook, *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 88-90.

1.2.4 Comparative Studies with Other Biblical Literature

As Jacob Milgrom observes, Ezekiel is "the only one outside of Moses who authored a corpus of legislation."[40] Accordingly, many scholars propose that the prophet acts as a new Moses.[41] The present study is also relevant to this theme, but places more stress on what Ezekiel learned from history and how he attempted to overcome the limits of Moses' era as well as the time of Ezekiel himself. Thus, my position is somewhat contrastive to the view of Milgrom, who argues that Ezekiel is at best a partial Moses. Recently, as "Theological Perspectives of the Book of Ezekiel" section on the SBL national meeting (2013-14) has encouraged, the comparative studies of this area have focused on the directions and the fruits of the intertextual readings between Ezekiel and Pentateuch corpuses.[42]

George. A. Cooke and Hans Wildberger respectively argue that Ezekiel is dependent on the Holiness Code, based on the text analysis that the author assumed his audience knew the

---

[40] Jacob Milgrom, *Ezekiel's Hope: A Commentary on Ezekiel 38-48* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2012), 218.

[41] In terms of reception history, this Ezekiel-New Moses conception has produced many fruitful compositions. For example, Ezekiel's Exagôgê, the Greek dramatic literature in the 2nd century B.C.E. ca. reflects this rabbinic tradition that depicts Ezekiel with Moses' in Exodus figure. Followings are the modern scholarly recognitions on this matter: Milgrom*, Ezekiel's Hope*, 216; Jon D. Levenson, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48*, HSM 10 (Missoula: Scholars, 1976), 38; Henry McKeating, "Ezekiel the 'Prophet Like Moses'?," *JSOT* 61 (1994): 97–109; Michael Fishbane, *Haftarot*, JPS Bible Commentary (Philadelphia: JPS, 2002), 356; Marvin A. Sweeney, "Some Issues Concerning the Book of Ezekiel in Talmudic Literature," in idem, *Reading Prophetic Books: Form, Intertextuality, and Reception in Prophetic and Post-Biblical Literature* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014)*,* 363-75.

[42] David Carr, "Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence: An Empirical Test of Criteria Applied to Exodus 34, 11-26 and Its Parallels," in *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Ex 32-34 und Dtn 9-10*, ed. Matthias Kockert and Erhard Blum, Veroffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft fur Theologie 18 (Gutersloh: Gutersloher Verlagshaus, 2001), 112; Michael Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code*, LHB/OTS 507 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 59-67; Jeffery Leonard, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case," *JBL* 127, no. 2 (2008): 241-65; William A. Tooman, *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38-39*, FAT II/52 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 31-34.

concept of such expressions and terms as "the year of release" in the Holiness Code (i.e.,

Leviticus 25).[43]

Based on the notion that the Priestly writer's more concrete knowledge of the distinction

between Levites and priests than what is found in Ezekiel's presentation, Menahem Haran argues

that P predates Ezekiel and that Ezekiel was part of the priestly school.[44] With the similar

principle of the conceptual comparison, and opposing the position of Wellhausen, John Bergsma

suggests another mother text for the book of Ezekiel, Z as Zion, in addition to P and H. Bergsma

examines chapters 34 and 46 as a case study with Leviticus 25 and concludes that Ezekiel 40-48

is a conceptual fusion of Priestly/Holiness concepts with Zion theology.[45] His argument that

Ezekiel is a critical advocate for the adaptation of various available sources is convincing and the

present study stands on the same side with this position. But the degree of the influence of Zion

theology should be critically reviewed since the book of Ezekiel shows both a gloomy view on

the monarchy and a hopeful expectation of the return of the Davidic monarch at the same time.

Of course, although more depth study should follow, the identity of "My Servant David" in

---

[43] George Albert Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936), 512-13; Hans Wildberger, " Israel und sein Land," *EvTh* 16 (1956): 415. For the review of the two corpuses, see, Risa Levitt Kohn, *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, The Exile and the Torah*, JSOTSup 358 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), especially her appendix.

[44] Menahem Haran, "The Law-Code of Ezekiel XL-XLVIII and Its Relation to the Priestly School," *HUCA* 50 (1979): 45-71; idem, *Temples and Temple service in Ancient Israel* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1985); idem, "Ezekiel, P, and the Priestly School," *VT* 58 (2008): 211-18.

[45] John Sietze Bergsma, "The Jubilee: A Post-Exilic Priestly Attempt to Reclaim Lands?" *Bib* 84 (2003): 225–46; idem, "The Temple as 'Built Jubilee' in Ezekiel," *Proceedings of the Eastern Great Lakes and Midwestern Biblical Societies* 24 (2004) 75-85; idem, *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation,* VTSup 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2007); idem, "The Biblical Manumission Laws: Has the Literary Dependence of H on D Been Demonstrated?," in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*, ed. Eric F. Mason et. al., JSJSup 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 65-91.

chapters 34 and 37 has some possibility of the symbolic combination of the Mosaic and Zion tradition for the adjustment of the post-exilic society. If God will need to choose a leader from the house of David again, that "David" must be always under the category of "my servant David" rather than an independent King of human history. Moreover, it seems striking that the final versions of the Pentateuch and of the book of Ezekiel share a common perspective in terms of de-emphasis of the monarchy. Risa Levitt Kohn also observes some fusion style of Priestly-Holiness and Deuteronomic terminology in the book of Ezekiel, and concludes the possibility of Ezekiel as the redactor of the Pentateuch.[46]

1.2.5 Interests on Psychological Aspects of Ezekiel's Prophecy

Alongside the literary and rhetorical analyses, recent scholarship has also suggested the use of trauma studies as a window into Ezekiel's language and theology. Hölscher viewed that all prophecies in the Hebrew Bible, though it experienced ethical and cultural transformation, have somewhat ecstatic aspects which are also found in the Canaanite religion. This view on the ecstasy as a primary feature of the prophecy has influenced on the study of the prophetic book including Karl Jaspers' ethnographic study.[47] Edwin Broome's article "Ezekiel's Abnormal Personality" is the work of focusing on Ezekiel's hallucinatory pathological mental illness and preoccupation with the female sexuality.[48]

Recent scholarship in this field, however, shows some shift from the study of the prophet himself to the traumatic nature of the exilic experiences in general. In other words, recently

---

[46] Risa Levitt Kohn, "Ezekiel, the Exile, and the Torah," in *SBL 1999 Seminar Papers* (1999): 501–26; idem, "A Prophet Like Moses? Rethinking Ezekiel's Relationship to the Torah," *ZAW* 114 (2002): 236–54.

[47] Karl Jaspers, "Der Prophet Ezechiel: Eine pathgraphische Studie,"in *Arbeiten zur Psychiatrie*, Festschrift für K. Schneider, ed. H. Kranz, (Heidelberg: L. Schneider, 1947), 77.

[48] Edwin C. Broome, "Ezekiel's Abnormal Personality," *JBL* 65 (1946): 277-92.

scholars pay more attention to the "how" question. This "how" question is based on the presupposition that the devastating characteristic of war and deportation, suffering in living as strangers, etc., which Ezekiel and his audience might go through in the early part of the sixth century B.C.E., must be expressed and influenced in the text composition in terms of the overcome of cognitive dissonance. Thus, this kind of psychological study enhances the explanation of some of the book's unique rhetoric and imagery.[49] In this approach, however, we need to be careful not to hurry in applying any incomprehensible behaviors in our eyes as Ezekiel's or the author's psychopathic abhorrence. For example, we need to question whether Nancy Bowen or David Halperin's critiques on loathing and dreadful female sexuality have a sound ground of the text.[50] Those actions can be interpreted as a very thoughtful and calculated reaction when the exiled priest-prophet envisions the future as a revision of the failed history. Nonetheless, Halperin's interpretation of the Jerusalem temple tour in chapters 8-11 as the Ezekiel's inner landscape when the priest-prophet reacted to his surrounded environment will be helpful in my Edward Soja's Thirdsapcing analysis and in heterotopic applications.[51]

---

[49] Nancy Bowen, *Ezekiel*, Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries (Nashville: Abingdon, 2010); Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, "Reassessing the Historical and Sociological Impact of the Babylonian Exile (597/587-539 BCE)," in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Conceptions*, ed. James M. Scott, JSJSup 56 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 7-36; David Halperin, "Seeking Ezekiel," in *Peace and Justice Shall Embrace: Power and Theopolitics in the Bible: Essays in Honor of Millard Lind,* ed. Ted Grimsrud and Loren L. Johns (Telford, PA: Pandora, 1999), 108-44; David G. Garber Jr., "Traumatizing Ezekiel, the Exilic Prophet," in *Psychology and the Bible: A New Way to Read the Scriptures, From Genesis to Apocalyptic Vision,* vol. 2, ed. J. Harold Ellens and Wayne G. Rollins, Praeger Perspectives: Psychology, Religion, and Spirituality (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004), 215-35.

[50] Bowen, *Ezekiel*; Halperin, *Seeking Ezekiel.*

[51] Halperin, *Seeking Ezekiel*, 39-80.

1.3 History of Interpretations on Ezekiel 8-11

One of the most debated issues of Ezekiel 8-11 in the early 20th century was about the location of the vision, and according to the locations, scholars have distinguished the possible editorial layers. Ironically, that debate came from the observation of the very vivid descriptions of the Jerusalem Temple in this unit. As I briefly introduced, Volkmar Herntrich asserted that Ezekiel prophesied in Palestine, not in Babylonia. For him, the literary style shown in Ezekiel 8 and 11:1-13 cannot be ignored as an "eyewitness" scene. Since the two sub-units play as the opening and closing block of the unit respectively, Herntrich argues the author of this unit must have spent the time in Palestine or even lived there for his entire lifetime.[52] The scholars, who held this view, including C. C. Torrey, James Smith, and William Brownlee, explain the Babylonian-related scenes as the redactor/editor's later work.[53] Nonetheless, those scholars concentrated too much on reading the "vivid" description of the scene and (intentionally) ignored the genre of the unit, i.e., vision, assuming the locale of the vision as a mere reflection of the reality at that time.

Redaction and form critical scholars have taken diachronic discussions of this unit seriously, especially on chapter 11. Based on the shift of the location and the description of the glory of YHWH in 11:22-24, which shows parallels with chapters 1 and 10, Zimmerli attributes most parts of chapters 8-11 as original and sees only 11:1-21 as a "foreign element."[54] Despite his leaning on Zimmerli's basic analysis, Garscha attributes the date of this unit to the fourth century B.C.E. Also, his diagnosis on chapter 11 is different from Zimmerli, which Garscha

---

[52] Herntrich, *Ezechielprobleme*, 37-45.

[53] Torrey, *Psuedo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy*; Smith, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*; William H. Brownlee, *Ezekiel 1-19*, WBC 19 (Waco: Word Books, 1986), xx-xxiii.

[54] Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 187-253.

concludes 11:1-5, 6-10, 13-20 as the original narrative.[55] Pohlmann suggests another solution on

chapter 11, arguing that 11:2-13 is the oldest part of this unit. For him, the Babylonian

background texts, such as 8:1, 3d, 5-18, are so called "*golah*-oriented redaction" and must be

designated to an original vision in Babylon.[56] Achim Behrens' work on redaction criticism is

noteworthy in this discussion. In classifying the editorial layers of chapters 8 through 11, he sets

8:5-9:11 as the oldest material as pre-587, as well as 11:14-21 as the original material by Ezekiel

as the intentionally interwoven text with the destruction of Jerusalem. For Behrens, in the

priestly exilic redaction, the two units, 8:1-4 and 11:22-25, work as the enclosing frame of the

demarcation. As expected, Behrens attributes chapter 10, a departure of YHWH's glory, to the

core priestly redaction.[57] However, regarding chapter 11, Allen considers the possible integrity

of chapters 8-11 and takes the middle position on the book of Ezekiel. He also separates the two

parts of chapter 11 (vv.1-13 and vv. 14-21) with a different origin assigned to each part.[58]

Contrary to this redactional stream, as Janina Maria Hiebel summarizes, a new discussion

table on the book of Ezekiel with both diachronic and synchronic approaches was set up during

1980s, and the unit of Ezekiel 8-11 plays an important role as a case study to test.[59] Ironically,

---

[55] Garscha, *Studien zum Ezechielbuch*, 252-62.

[56] Pohlmann and Thilo Alexander Rudnig, *Das Buch des Propheten Hesekiel (Ezechiel) / Übersetzt und erklärt von Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 29, 35, 123-69.

[57] Achim Behrens, "Prophetische Visionsschilderungen im Alten Testament," in idem, *Sprachliche Eigenarten, Funktion und Geschichte einer Gattung*, AOAT 292 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002), 210-51.

[58] Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 1-19*, WBC 28 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1994), 131. As we observed, Allen's main position is to keep the original authorship in the most parts so that the rest analysis on chapters 9 through11 shows more than 80% of the authentic authorship.

[59] Janina Maria Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives: A Redaction- Critical and Theological Study*, BZAW 475 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 17.

Greenberg was the initial runner to choose this unit as an example of his holistic interpretation.[60] This unit is regarded as a combined composition even to the scholar who sees this part as pseudepigraphic.[61]

Meanwhile, Marvin Sweeney goes beyond the previous scholarship both diachronically and synchronically in his study on Ezekiel 8-11. Diachronically he weighs more on the final form of chapters 8-11 through seeking the internal coherent structure within the text, although he does not ignore various redactional layers of the text and reflects the considerations to the historical settings of his form critical analysis. In a synchronic discussion, Sweeney suggests understanding Ezekiel's identity and role as both priest and prophet rather than as two different and even tensional relationships. With this new understanding of characterization, Sweeney interprets the destruction of Jerusalem commanded in Ezekiel 8-11 both as a divine punishment and as a purification process for the later recreation.[62] Block's work, as we have seen earlier, also helps to understand the departure of the glory of YHWH in the divine abandonment context of ANE literature.[63]

---

[60] Greenberg, "Vision of Jerusalem in Ezekiel 8-11: A Holistic Interpretation," in *The Divine Helmsman: Studies on God's Control of Human Events, Fest. Lou H. Silberman*, eds. J. L. Crenshaw and S. Sandmel (New York: Ktav, 1980), 143-64.

[61] Joachim Becker, "Ez 8-11 als einheitliche Komposition in einem pseudepigraphischen Ezechielbuch," in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*, 136-50.

[62] Sweeney, "The Destruction of Jerusalem as Purification in Ezekiel 8-11," in *Form and Intertextuality*, 144-55. See also Lester L. Grabbe's article "Priest Is without Honor in His Own Prophet: Priests and Other Religious Specialists in the Latter Prophets," in *The Priests in the Prophets. The Portrayal of Priests, Prophets and Other Religious Specialists in the Latter Prophets,* ed. L. L. Grabbe and Alice Ogden Bellis, JSOTSup 408 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 79-97.

[63] Block, "Divine Abandonment," 15-42.

1.4 Setting of the Possible Dates for the Intertextual Readings between Ezekiel 8-11 and its Interrelated Texts (Genesis 18-19; 2 Kings 22-23; P/H)

Admitting the various editorial works in the book of Ezekiel, I take a middle position that Clements and Allen set up; I also lean more toward the possibility of a written form first, as Davis suggested. We need to remain alert to the existence of the various visible and invisible editorial layers, since, as Joyce advises, the diachronic task is a tall order but not an impossible or invalid task.[64]

Several terms should be defined in accordance of traditional scholarship. Regarding the corpus of Deuteronomy and relevant texts, "D" refers to the legal collection of Deuteronomy 12-26, "Deuteronomy" is the book of Deuteronomy, and "DtrH" means books which are assumed to reflect the Deuteronomistic history. Regarding priestly writings, "H" refers to the Holiness Code in Leviticus 17-26 while "P" stands for priestly writings which are reflected in several blocks of Exodus through Numbers as well as scattered strata to shape the frameworks of Pentateuch.

From its literary setting to the probable historical settings, diachronic discussions on Ezekiel 8-11 show a relatively narrow temporal range between the early exilic and the post-fall of Jerusalem as depicted in Ezekiel 33. In my intertextual reading of the Ezekiel 8-11 text, several texts in the Hebrew Bible will be discussed together. Narratives of King Ahaz, of King Manasseh, and of King Josiah in 2 Kings will be invited in an attempt to figure out the portrayal of the temple which Ben Adam saw in Ezekiel 8. Finally, the characterization of Ben Adam in Ezekiel 9 as a mediator and the overall scenery of the city destruction in relation to the divine judgment in Ezekiel 9-10 would call the Sodom and Gomorrah text in Genesis 18-19 to the discussion table.

---

[64] Joyce, "Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives on Ezekiel," 122-25.

The consultation of the relationship between Genesis 18-19 and the book of Ezekiel appears with a more confident direction since the latter has the former's vocabularies including "Abraham" and "Sodom" as well as the thematic parallels. Traditionally, the Sodom and Gomorrah narrative is considered as P,[65] and P is as late as the contemporary of the book of Ezekiel, i.e., not later than the book of Ezekiel. From this basis, we conclude that the Ezekiel community must have known the story of Abraham as well as the tragic story of Sodom and Gomorrah. Jacob L. Wrights' comment also supports my conclusion that "Sodom and Gomorrah" stands as "the paradigmatic instance of urbicide" for the biblical authors.[66]

The examination of the present study will also include the possible connections of Ezekiel 8-11 with the Josiah reform. Thus, we need to examine the relationship between D, P/H, and the book of Ezekiel as well as between D and P/H, too.[67] Several scholars, including Klaus Grünwaldt, have argued that H is younger than D.[68] Juha Pakkala elaborates on the relationship

---

[65] Antony F. Campbell and Mark A. O'Brien, *Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introductions, Annotations* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 21-88, also Index of Biblical Passages by Source, 260.

[66] Jacob L. Wright, "Urbicide: The Ritualized Killing of Cities in the Ancient Near East," in *Ritual Violence in the Hebrew Bible,* ed. Saul M. Olyan (New York: Oxford University, 2015), 157-58.

[67] Recently, Ben Zion Katz argues that the author of the book of Ezekiel was not only familiar to the composite Pentateuch but also to the entire Torah. One of his examples is relevant to the first temple vision account in Ezekiel 8-11 (esp., 8:4) with the Exodus 24 text in terms of their language and concepts. Ben Zion Katz, "The Pentateuch Quoted Intact: Evidence from Ezekiel and Psalms," *Jewish Bible Quarterly*, 43, no. 4 (2015): 257-62. Jeffrey Stackert's works are also noteworthy for his focusing on literary use of E as a Pentateuchal source in other literary presentations. Jeffrey Stackert, *A Prophet Like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion,* (New York: Oxford University, 2014), 31-36; idem, *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness legislation* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007). Meanwhile, Lauren A. S. Monroe argues that the Josiah narrative in 2 Kings 22-23 shows the combination of D and P/H. With this logic, he dates the Josiah text relatively late after P or H. Lauren A. S. Moore, *Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[68] Klaus Grünwaldt, *Heilgkeitsgesetz*, 375-79.

between H and D from the insight of H's attitude on using D. He argues that D must be a resource for H, but not with the heavy imperative to follow all the points of D. This freer use means that "the author could use the mother text as source but could omit, rearrange, rewrite, and expand the source text to accord with his own conceptions and to accommodate it to his wider compositional aims."[69] As a result, according to Pakkala, the principle of the law of D might be preserved in H, but shows significant different expressions and details in H.[70] In terms of our discussion, if this is the case that the book of Ezekiel knew H, then the compositional group of the book of Ezekiel also knew either D itself or embodied D within H.

1.5 Thesis and Chapter Outline

Casual readers of Ezekiel 8-11 may conclude with their impression that these four chapters show the judgment on Jerusalem and the temple during the national crisis of Babylonian exile. It is true that the vision is filled with the judgment languages. However, despite various prevailing judgment images, this first temple vision also shows salvation or redemption in 11:14-21. Thus, I would recommend reading Ezekiel 8-11 as a miniature of the book of Ezekiel, which contains both judgment and restoration. In other words, we may find here the essential issues of the book of Ezekiel as well as the basic concept of the solution.

One of the serious questions that the book of Ezekiel asks is to where YHWH's sanctuary shall go, if the first chosen place has been proved as inappropriate. This "moving YHWH's Sanctuary" is, in my reading, a driving motif of the plot development and a key to opening every

---

[69] The statement above would work on Ezekiel's application on his writing based on the available sources or memories. We see the detailed reflections on the discussion of Ezekiel 8. Reinhard Muller, R. B. ter Haar Romeny, and Juha Pakkala, "From Small Additions to Rewriting in the Story about the Burning of Jerusalem," in *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 123.

[70] Juha Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted: Omissions in the Transmission of the Hebrew Bible* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 143-44.

room in the book of Ezekiel. With the basic concept that "YHWH's sanctuary" means where YHWH dwells, the book of Ezekiel expresses this concept in various terms including "throne" (כִּסֵּא) as the divine seat itself , "sanctuary" (מִקְדָּשׁ) as a spatial entity in a narrow sense, and "the house" (הַבַּיִת) in a broad sense.

Concerning the movement of YHWH's sanctuary, the book asks the questions of why, when, who, where, and how. A "why" question challenges readers to think of what makes the house of Israel being reprimanded; what makes YHWH move his sanctuary; and what would be the crucial condition that the human dwelling place (city) and the divine dwelling place (temple) keep harmony each other.

A "when" question calls for both departure and return of YHWH's sanctuary. If I redefine this question, it is related to the judgment process and the restoration process in the logical order. Interestingly, as I will unpack later, human repentance is not the critical motif to activate the process in the book of Ezekiel.

For the same reason, a "where" question calls for two kinds of "to where" question. First, from the Jerusalem temple, "to where" the sanctuary shall go? The answer for the first question was reveled in Ezekiel 11, as among the *golah* community. Then second question comes up later as a subsequent question: "to where" the departed sanctuary shall return? In other words, what criteria shall the candidates of the new place pass in order to let YHWH's sanctuary return and keep it forever in that place?

A "how" question leads us to study the three visions together, the first vision (chs. 1-3), the first temple vision (chs. 8-11) as the present study will focus, and the final vision (chs. 40-48). In other words, this question is related to the depictions of the departure and return of YHWH; thus, it brings YHWH's glory and entourages of YHWH together.

Finally, a "who" question is actually a question of "with whom" and "without whom" rather than "who" as the agent of the moving decision. The decision of moving the sanctuary absolutely depends on YHWH himself, as he does everything in his will. Then, with whom, will YHWH dwell once he abandoned his temple and the city? Will he hide his face entirely and dwell himself alone? Or, will he still reveal himself and his dwelling place? Ezekiel 11:16 claims that, by the promise of YHWH, the Jehoiachin *golah* community becomes people with whom YHWH will dwell during the Babylonian exile. What does it mean? Who is discarded and who is chosen, on what basis?

With the three dimensional approaches, the present study will argue that Ezekiel 8-11 is about the story of moving YHWH's sanctuary from Jerusalem to the exilic community. By focusing on this moving, this vision narrative contains both didactic and polemical colors, claiming that any kind of hope in the future should come from the *golah* community not from the Jerusalemites. This argument must have been radical enough that only visionary genre can cover the claim of the prophet. Interestingly, this claim indeed has its root from captives' nostalgia towards Jerusalem, and therefore intends to break the very nostalgia. Jerusalem and the temple, once a chosen place by YHWH himself and the holy center of the universe, become a dystopia, the place of never-return. Just as nostalgia has two fold ramifications, so making Jerusalem a dystopia has two-side implication. If Jerusalem is killed by this dystopia making, Tel Abib, the village of the *golah* community in Babylon, becomes a meaningful space like the wilderness that prepared the first Exodus generation to enter the Promise Land. Here also, the key to claim lies in "YHWH's moving his sanctuary" in the midst of the exiles. Lastly, as a reader, I interpret that the claims and interest of Ezekiel 8-11, which concentrates on the matters of the past and future in the land of Israel, is a practice of making their exilic life a heterotopia. Exile is to situate one's

29

life into nowhere. This "nowhere" feeling is equally applicable to both human beings and to their deity in its concept. In this liminality, and indeterminacy, "here and now" communication is ironically meaningless and even awkward, but the vision language would fit better. Making a heterotopia is, therefore, a way of expanding one's space, of dreaming the future based on the past, and of resisting the dominant foreignness. And, all of these diagnoses and solutions are not irrelevant to us, whose lives are also situated in the postmodern rootless era.

The present study has three Parts to unpack this thesis. Part I Laying "Flexible" Foundations consists of two chapters: Chapter 1 as Introduction and Chapter 2 as Methodologies: Definitions and General Applications. Chapter 1 Introduction brings in the issues in reading Ezekiel 8-11 and the history of interpretations on the book of Ezekiel with the shifts of the Ezekiel scholarship as well as the history of interpretations on Ezekiel 8-11 since the early 20th century. Chapter 2 Methodologies introduces four main methodologies in reading the text: advanced form critical analysis; discourse analysis, intertextual readings and writings, and spatial theory with the memory study. To avoid redundancy, Chapter 2 will more focus on the definitions of the main terms and applicable general examples from the book of Ezekiel, though I will not exclude the theory- text discussions if necessary.

Part II, Descending to Dystopia is about the advanced form critical analysis on Ezekiel 8-11. According to the formal structure division of the text, Part II has three chapters (Chapters 3, 4, and 5) of the text analysis and one chapter of synthesis on the overall structure (Chapter 6). While Chapters 3 and 5 are opening and closing verses of the vision, Chapter 4 Jerusalem in the Vision handles the whole vision marked by three occurrences of "The Spirit Lifted Me Up." Chapter 6 Structures deals with the formal, semantic, and overall structures as the three dimensional understanding of the text.

With the several critical analyses on Ezekiel 8-11 in Part II, Part III aims to situating

Ezekiel 8-11 in the book of Ezekiel in order to appreciate its theological reflections and possible

implications for today. If Part II is devoted to the form critical analysis, discourse analysis, and

intertextual reading, Part III will concentrate on its temporal and spatial issues as well as their

underlying theological intentions. Form critically speaking, Part III will serve as Interpretation or

Intention of Ezekiel 8-11. Chapter 7 Killing Jerusalem, Killing Babylon, and Killing False Hope

will deal with the nostalgia and dystopia issues in Ezekiel 8-11 in the larger context of Ezekiel 1-

39. Chapter 8 Indeterminacy and Heterotopia from Situated Nowhere is about the temporal and

spatial interpretations of the theological reaction of the book of Ezekiel. It will review the

discussions of the text-based analyses in Part II, now from the perspective of the exilic leader,

Ben Adam. As a concluding chapter, Chapter 9 Answers for the Questions in Introduction wraps

up this study by answering ten questions in Introduction.

1.6 Scope and Limitation of the study

This study attempts to extend to cover both historical and literary dimensions of each text

by comparison. Based on the examinations of the various diachronic issues in P, D, H, and the

book of Ezekiel, this study will argue that the author of the book of Ezekiel must have known

those sources or at least the community of Ezekiel must have been aware of the ideas in those

documents. Regarding the textual critical examination, this study is in most cases limited to

examine the Hebrew text as presented in BHS or BHQ unless serious textual issues arise.

Accordingly, readers will see several MT and LXX comparisons in the form critical analysis.

As mentioned above, in order to understand the multiple dimensions of Ezekiel 8-11, the reading strategy needs to be also three-dimensional. In addition to advanced form criticism, narratology, and discourse analysis for the textual analysis, the present study will therefore employ several interdisciplinary methodologies including space related theories, theory of collective memory and of forgetting, and intertextual reading strategies. Including form critical method, these methodologies are modern/postmodern interpreters' tools which the authors of the book of Ezekiel might not have consciously employed in the text's composition. Nonetheless, the book of Ezekiel is a complete literary work in which many traditional, social, and cultural histories have been embedded; accordingly, the book indeed invites its readers to bring their reasonable methods in order to enhance their understandings. Careful practice of advanced form criticism may prevent us from imposing our assumptions upon the text, or it at least constantly alerts us to admit what we bring to the text reading. It is good to keep Sweeney's solemn warning as a starting point of the text reading that no matter what perspectives or even biases the reader brought on his/her reading, reading should be based on "the text that was written by an author or authors who wrote with well-defined intentions in specific sets of socio-historical circumstances."[71] This is the reason that the present study first applies form critical analysis on the text, whose primary purpose lies in the intention of the text from the diverse dimensions of the text.

---

[71] Sweeney, "Form criticism," in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Applications. Rev. and expanded*, ed. Stephen R. Haynes, and Steven L. McKenzie (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), 83.

2.1 Advanced Form Critical Analysis

The term "form criticism" may sound somewhat obsolete in the ears of biblical critics in the postmodern era since the development history of this methodology shows that earlier form criticism started from isolating the individual units from the larger contexts. As the works of Sweeney demonstrate, however, form criticism has now actively transformed itself by doing dialogue with other critical methodologies.[72] This self-transformation or expansion of its scope as responses for various demands is noteworthy enough that the biblical scholarship respects this change by defining it as "advanced" form criticism,[73] distinguishing from "classical" form criticism.

2.1.1 History of Form Criticism

The "classical" form criticism in the early 20th century is more of the search for an independent self-contained unit beyond the written traditions of the text as Herman Gunkel sought. Based on this, history of form criticism in Hebrew Bible thus can be summarized in four phases: (1) searching for a short, self-contained unit and its *Sitz im Leben*; (2) understanding the context: searching for the larger unit; (3) challenges and responses; and (4) advanced form criticism with other critical methodologies.

---

[72] A fine review is provided by Sweeney "Form Criticism," 58-89. See also John Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*, 2nd ed. (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1996), 30-44. Although Sweeney has practiced form critical methods throughout his various commentaries including *Isaiah 1-39* (FOTL 16); more recent development of his works can be found in his *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature,* FAT 45 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 2005; and *Reading Prophetic Books*: *Form, Intertextuality, and Reception in Prophetic and Post-Biblical Literature,* FAT 89 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

[73] Marvin Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi, eds., *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003). In this section, I will only deal with the works which are more directly relevant to the current discussion. Thus, for the brief overview of history of Form criticism, see the reference above footnote 72.

(1) Searching for a short, self-contained unit and its *Sitz im Leben:*

Among the first phase runners, works of Herman Gunkel and Claus Westermann are most relevant to the form critical analysis of the current study. At the first phase, the main task of interpreters was to search for a short, self-contained unit in order to find the pure form of the text and to look for the possible *Sitz im Leben* of the text. From the late 1800s to mid-1900s, biblical criticism emphasized diachronic considerations in an attempt to understand a text's *Sitz im Leben*. Behind the focus on short, self-contained, "original" oral speech units (the pre-literary forms behind the present text) lies the assumption that the purest and most creative religious expressions are found in the earlier stages of human development and this form was (at least partially) maintained in the process of transmission. As a founder of the "classical" form criticism, Gunkel initiated the innovative work at his time through his works including *The Legends of Genesis* and *An Introduction to the Psalms*.[74] While the biblical field was dominated by the Wellhausenian idea which pursued possible written sources behind the present text, Gunkel attempted to push further beyond the earliest written sources into the realm of oral traditions of mythology and folklore. With this study, he hoped that these pure religious expressions could work as an authoritative basis in the modern age, too. From the advanced form critical perspective, this seems hard to accept since what is given to us, whether Genesis or a prophetic book, is an entire book in its final/present form, claiming that it has a religious authority. Nonetheless, Gunkel's "short, self-contained unit" still plays an important role in the formal structural analysis, especially in making demarcations of the unit. However, we should

---

[74] Hermann Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga and History*, trans. William Herbert Carruth (New York: Schocken Books, 1964); idem, *Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*, trans. Joachim Begrich, Mercer Library of Biblical Studies (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1939).

now handle Gunkel's each unit as rather "sub-units," i.e., we shall not isolate them as independent units, until we meet the same level of the formal demarcating sign(s). Another critical review is his genre definition. Gunkel defined genres, including legend or saga, based on the thematic/content classification rather than by its unique form.

Gunkel's content-based genre classification has been overcome by Claus Westermann. Although Westermann belongs to the later generation, I classify him in the first phase of classical form criticism because of his serious study of the short, self-contained unit, expressed in his various formulae discoveries in *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*.[75] He identifies the three major kinds of speech in prophetic books: 1) accounts (historical narratives in the Former Prophets); 2) prophetic speeches (most popular in the classical prophetic books); and 3) utterances (like lament and praise).

Drawing on the parallel expressions in the Mari letter, Westermann argues that this messenger speech is a basic prophetic form, showing the authenticity of "Thus says XX" between sender and receiver.[76] Westermann's remarkable efforts to pay attention to the basic forms of the prophetic books are still noteworthy, especially in the examination of the "Ben Adam" pattern and various report forms in the book of Ezekiel. As Sweeney and Rendtorff point out, however, it is questionable if we can treat this speech as isolated from other generic elements in the prophetic speech.[77]

Compared to Gunkel, who focused on the motifs in genre study, Westermann shows an advanced study, especially in terms of his genre definition and study. Going beyond Genkel,

---

[75] Claus Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967).

[76] Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, 161-65.

[77] Sweeney, *Isaiah 1–39,* 541-44; Rolf Rendtorff, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*, JSOTSup 89 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 193.

35

Westermann should be remembered as one of the first scholars who pondered the detailed definition of form or genre. His two-part form analysis on the prophetic judgment speech—indictment or accusation and the announcement of judgment introduced by לכן "therefore"—has provided us the tools to recognize the logic between the cause and result more clearly in its generic forms as well as in the contents.[78] Moreover, he contributed to the form critical study by setting the essential questions that form criticism must ask: who speaks; to whom; in what situation and how.

Nonetheless, Westermann's study still maintains the search for the smallest units of speech with the assumption that these small units are the purest. From the perspective of the later generation of form criticism, Westermann's genre definition seems rather too rigid than having the generating power of typicality. For instance, recent literary and rhetorical criticisms do not give the priority to identifying the minimal oral unit of a speech, but considers it as one task or one-step among many to serve their own critical goals.

(2) Understanding the Larger Context:

With the legacies of the first phase of the movement, form critics began to attempt to understand the text with its contexts, searching for the larger unit. I will pay attention to the works of Gerhard von Rad and of Martin Noth, in terms of their efforts to embrace the given text in the larger contexts. Gerhard von Rad is known as the advocate of Old Testament reading through the short historical creed. Although he spent much time on the diachronic approach in his study, von Rad strongly warned his readers to admit that our diachronic investigation starts without any firm evidence, despite our wish to find it. With this realization, von Rad emphasizes

---

[78] Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, 167.

two things in our study on the pursuit of the compositional growth of the text: 1) we need to keep the distance not to become rigid applicants of the assumption but to appreciate the stages of the development of the text; and 2) we need to keep the balance between "the constant and variable elements" in comparisons of the text.[79] With this notion, indeed von Rad laid the foundation of "Laying Flexible Foundations" in this study. More specifically, his explanation of biblical author's free adaptations of the creed in cult lyrics makes me clearer in understanding of the embedded unfamiliar traditions and histories in the book of Ezekiel.[80] According to von Rad's view, this freedom in reading the traditions and in writing as the application is the essence of the biblical interpretation of the ancient biblical authors. If this is the case, then we modern readers should be aware of this fact, too.

Martin Noth, another reference point of the present study, concentered his attention on shared features of style and theology from the books of Joshua, Judges, 1 & 2 Samuel, and 1 & 2 Kings. For Noth, the commonalities are subsumed under the Deuteronomist (Dtr)'s central theological concern and motivation of the composition. Dtr, which Noth conjectured, believed that Israel's history was the history of decline/failure until the destruction by the Babylonians. In support of this argument, Noth points to one typical speech type in the works of Dtr, Joshua 1 and 23, 1 Samuel 12, and 1 Kings 8. The speeches of one kind, all being situated in the context of the pivotal transitional moment of Israel history, show the same pattern that it would usually give summaries and then interpretations of the past events.[81]

---

[79] Gerhard von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, trans. E. W. Trueman- Dicken (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996), 3.

[80] Von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, 13.

[81] Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, trans. Bernhard W. Anderson (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972).

With this new concept, Noth could suggest that the redactor is not just a hodgepodge collector but a theologian. He also could identify the larger literary units as genres. Indeed, his contribution was to shift the biblical scholarship of his time toward looking at superstructures and frameworks. Nonetheless, as we shall see, his theory was modified by the next generations, producing many DtrH scholar groups who have proposed more detailed layers of the DtrH corpus. As Thomas Römer evaluates, they are still classified as the scholars of pursing the oral traditions.[82]

(3) Challenges and Responses:

One of the challenges to the classical form criticism to lead to shift to the 3rd phase came from a rhetorical critic James Muilenburg.[83] Muilenburg pointed out that form criticism was influenced too much by classical and Germanic philology rather than Semitic linguistic elements. Accordingly, he suggested that form critics need to place more emphasis on the question of how the text is formulated to accomplish its goals. According to Muilenburg, since form and content are inextricably related, interpreters need to analyze the structural patterns of each passage by recognizing both the unique *and* typical elements of a text. Along with previous classical rhetoric and literary critical theory, Muilenburg emphasized that rhetoric signifies the art of composition, so the purpose is to discover the authorial intent.[84]

---

[82] Thomas Römer, "The Current Discussion on the so-called Deuteronomistic History: Literary Criticism and Theological Consequences," *Humanities: Christianity and Culture* 46 (2015): 43-66.

[83] James Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," *JBL* 88, no.1 (1969): 1-18; see also Phyllis Trible's rhetorical criticism after Muilenburg. Phyllis Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah,* Guides to Biblical Scholarship, Old Testament Series (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994).

[84] Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," 7-10.

Nonetheless, rhetorical criticism in this venue was less concerned about a *close* detailed syntactic analysis. Consequently, whatever extent of subjectivity is presumed in the process of reconstructing rhetorical devices. For the rhetorical critics, seeking "a" or "the" single meaning of the text would be the goal of exegesis but the reality consistently frustrates those interpreters. Some critics find this attempt untenable, and boldly suggest that searching for more meanings would be better.[85] So, in fact, we need a scope even though setting the scope itself also looks frustrating due to the involvement of the subjectivity. The best way to negotiate in this dilemma is to clarify one's position and admit that the proposed scope is one of many options. This is the way to practice laying "flexible" foundations, as reflected in the title of Part I. In this context, my scope of interpreting the text in the book of Ezekiel is to seek more than a single meaning but fewer than unlimited meanings, allowing for various historical, literary, rhetorical, intertextual settings. This is what the current study pursues in its diachronic approach of the text since it is impossible for us to set up the precise historical setting of the text. In other words, we should always admit the gap between literary audience and targeted audience, and think at least two or three possible original hearers/readers.

As another challenge, John Hays identifies the problems of form criticism: too close an association with the oral stages of tradition; the erroneous assumption that the shortest and clearest forms reflect the oldest and purest stages; the questionable use of the discipline to date traditions and texts; excessive claims in the re-creation of settings for genres.[86] Taking Hays' criticism seriously, I assume that this confusion might come from imprecise definition of

---

[85] James Watts, "The Rhetoric of Sacrifice," in *Ritual and Metaphor: Sacrifice in the Bible*, ed. Christian A. Eberhart (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 3-16, esp. 15.

[86] John H. Hays, *Old Testament Form Criticism,* Trinity University Monograph Series in Religion 2 (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974), 141-77.

Gattung and *Sitz im Leben*, i.e., uncertain connection between genres/formulae and historical settings at the time of classical form criticism and subsequent usages by the next generations.

Such a challenge threatened the end of form criticism, but there were efforts to overcome the problems as the FOTL series have made with the fourfold agenda: the study of structure, genre, setting, and intention/interpretation. Rolf Knierim, along with other scholars, responded and opened the door of "advanced" form criticism. Knierim argues that we should have flexible and multiple understandings of genres, settings, and their relationships and be careful in determination of the degree of the certainty of oral language in the written text.[87]

Previous form critical methodology tied "genre" as typical form closely and strictly to morphological aspects, and "setting" as a sociological category. On top of this, Knierim suggested re-fining the terms. In the interaction with the structuralism, he believed the typicality of certain forms was grounded in pre-rational structures of the human mind, or in the structuring preoccupation of the mind. Accordingly, both linguistic genres and sociological as well as institutional settings may possibly depend on this pre-conceptualization. Saussure's langue and parole are transformed in Knierim's conceptual analysis that the former as the mind's pre-linguistic activity and the latter as its actualization in the activity of the language. Knierim argued that the structure analysis of the individuality of texts must be made an inherent part of the form-critical method. Broadening the working definition of setting heuristically, Knierim attempted to replace the traditional settings in the text with the "basic structure of an existential human situation" as a matrix.[88]

---

[87] Rolf P. Knierim, *Text and Concept in Leviticus 1:1-9: A Case in Exegetical Method,* FAT 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 23-28.

[88] Rolf Knierim, *Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered*, Occasional papers: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity 6 (Claremont, CA: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, 1980), 451-56.

Knierim's integrated systematic approach to exegetical method proposed an engagement with other methods such as rhetorical, literary, and redaction criticism in a methodologically conceptualized way. With his conceptual analysis, he redefined the task of exegesis as to reconstruct a text's underlying assumptions and the system inherent in those assumptions. He set the heuristic aspect of this concept analysis, which makes the interpreter review her presuppositions in the middle of her exegesis and revise the first assumption. Nevertheless, in the post-modern perspective, the objectivity of the presupposition itself often turns to the doubtful thought with the label of "too much ideal." Unfortunately, it might be truly naïve to search for the author's intention and the mind underneath the text since human mind is never synthesized into one concept.

Meanwhile, Wolfgang Richter developed a morphologically grounded view of genre as a structural model. Furthermore, he distinguished the analysis of form (*Formkritik*: dealing with the uniqueness of the individual text) from the analysis of genre (*Gattungskritik*: dealing with the typical type of the text).[89] Although, with his study, form criticism pays more attention to the importance of studying the synchronic aspects of the text, Richter also seriously considered the text's diachronic/redaction history when he recognized the tension within the text. Richter's method involved a linguistic analysis of texts and will be used as a defining tool of form critical analysis in the current study. Klaus Koch in his *Was Ist Formgeschichte* also dealt with the relationship of linguistic analysis to form critical analysis. He spoke of the potential contribution of linguistic analysis to the method and the "disclosure of speech as structure and system." For him, speech unfolds hierarchically as an integrated expression characterized by intention. Koch

---

[89] Wolfgang Richter, *Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft: Entwurf Einer Alttestamentlichen Literaturtheorie Und Methodolgie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).

gives a prominent place to structural linguistics in his refinement or development of form critical

method and shows the constitutive importance that analysis of structure was coming to have in

form critical analysis relating to larger text entities and also to genres themselves.[90]

(4) Advanced Form Criticism[91] with Other Critical Methodologies:

Standing on the shoulders of those scholars who have responded to the challenge of

classical form criticism, now the advanced form criticism opens its new era. This advanced form

criticism does not limit itself to searching for presumed originally short, self-contained oral

forms of expression; rather, interpreters attempt to fully engage the literary dimensions of the

text. These dimensions include larger literary patterns that unite the smaller units. Finally,

advanced form criticism no longer postulates that genres are static or ideal forms that never

change. Recognizing the inherent fluidity of genres, their shifting historical and cultural

dependencies, and considering the rhetorical or communicative aspects of the text, advanced

form critical scholars have now begun to examine how genres are transformed to meet the needs

of a particular audience/situation.

Then, how will "form" in advanced form criticism play? The simplest answer would be

that form also serves the theme and the theme is shaped by the unique form of the text. This is

the reason that we need to keep the name "form criticism" even when advanced form criticism

attempts to embrace other methodologies. Overall, the history of form criticism may be the

---

[90] Klaus Koch, *Was Ist Formgeschichte: Neue Wege der Bibelexegese* (Berlin: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1967).

[91] The adjective "advanced" in front of form criticism is added in distinguishing from "classical" form criticism. This term already appeared in Sweeney's review on the history of form criticism in "Form Criticism," 85. Recently, using adjective "new", form critical exegetes published a collected essay on the study of the formation of the book of the Twelve. *The Book of the Twelve and the New Form Criticism*, Ancient Near East Monographs, eds. Mark J. Boda, Michael H. Floyd, and Colin M. Toffelmire (Atlanta: SBL, 2015).

pursuit of how to handle the presence of various gaps in the text. In this communicative venue, history of form criticism can be summarized in terms of various ways of dealing with the gap which interpreters find in their readings.

In my definition, gap is the detecting or/and alerting factors to interpreters due to the inconsistencies in the literary form, thematic concerns, or conceptual outlook of the text. It is something that makes readers stop and reflect upon their previous reading in an effort to make harmony. In communicating with the ancient text and with our contemporary audience, how shall we interpreters understand the gaps and how shall we fill those gaps? For the source critics, gaps must be various diachronic marks in the text which show distinct styles and unnatural connections between supposed different source collections. Gunkel's pursuit of the tradition-history from the oral tradition to the given present text can be seen as this effort, too. For Knierim's conceptual analysis, gap can play as a request marker of reexamination of the initiative concept which interpreters set up earlier. Sometimes this gap is obviously exposed even to the casual readers or at the first time reading/interpretation. But, in most cases, the gaps are recognized at the heuristic application stage, with the condition that the exegete faithfully follows the heuristic rule which Knierim suggested in his conceptual analysis.

Meanwhile, gap can be a useful tool for synchronic approaches, too. As Meir Sternberg expresses any textual inconsistency as "gap" and even probability of author's "gapping," gaps are attractive literary devices to call for readers' attentions.[92] Harald Schweizer observes some gap of the text as a calling to reconstruct illocutionary and perlocutionary aspects of language

---

[92] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*, 1st Midland book ed. Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987), 186-200.

like sign-act or performative commands.[93] For the reception critics or reader response critics

including Wolfgang Iser, gap can be understood as the responses of the later community of the

earlier text. For them, gap shows the indeterminacy in making the meaning of the text and it is

the invitation for the reader's participation. Van der Kooij's comparison work between MT and

LXX is also the effort to see the reader/translator's gap-filling as shown as rewriting in one's

own language and culture.[94]

In discovering, appreciating, and sometimes filling these gaps of the texts, both explicit

and implicit, advanced form criticism would provide a clear structure as well as would give room

for interpreters to use other methods. The flexibility of advanced form criticism, as reflected in

this chapter's title, Laying "Flexible" Foundations, makes the life of form criticism long-lasting

and has spurred its practitioners to refine and modify the methodology to create something more

useful. Thus, under the umbrella of "advanced" form criticism, other critical methods including

rhetorical criticism, redaction criticism, and insights from inner-biblical exegesis and even

reader-response criticism as readerial intertextual reading are all blossomed. As Sweeney

advocates, "Insofar as it provides the tools by which to assess the overall linguistic form and

content of a biblical text while continuing to interact with other critical methods, form criticism

is well positioned to serve as a fundamental method of biblical exegesis."[95]

---

[93] Harald Schweizer, *Metaphorische Grammatik: Wege Zur Integration Von Grammatik Und Textinterpretation in Der Exegese,* ATSAT 15 (Bd St. Ottilien: EOS-Verlag, 1981).

[94] Apparently works of Trible's rhetorical criticism and Van Der Kooij's translation comparison look irrelevant; however, those works are somewhat connected in terms of their interests on the text's communicative methods. While the former asks how the text speaks, the latter is interested in asking how the text communicates and functions in a different time and in a different version.

[95] Sweeney, "Form criticism," 85; idem, *Isaiah 1-39*, 10-15 for the theoretical foundation on the form criticism in the prophetic literature.

2.1.2 Form Critical Analysis in the Present Study

Odell also points to the difficulty in applying the early classical form criticism method to the book of Ezekiel because the book of Ezekiel shows exceptionally strong textual features, unlike other texts where early form criticism paid attention to the oral forms or general pattern in living socio-political situations.[96] In this current study, form criticism will refer to the "advanced" form criticism especially in an attempt to seek both diachronic and synchronic dimensions of the text. To understand both of these dimensions, literary and rhetorical criticisms will play an important role. With the literary analysis, this study will focus on the literary context, while, with the rhetorical analysis, the relationship between the possible audience and the speaker will be discussed more in-depth. In order to set up the literary audience and target audience, study of the diachronic dimensions is essential. Discussion about the growth of the text indeed makes us think of the intertextual idea. Intertextual reading will be another important partner of advanced form criticism. In exploring the concept of a dystopian city, such as is presented in Ezekiel 8-11, appreciation of intertextual entertainment of all users will be a natural reward of this study. This new concept of authorial, textual, and readerial intertextuality will contribute both diachronic and synchronic analyses of the book of Ezekiel.

Following the basic outline of the FOTL series, form critical analysis in the present study will proceed in four steps in order to get the intentions of the text: 1) Demarcation and Structure; 2) Genre(s) and Language; 3) Settings; and 4) Interpretation.

1) Structure

---

[96] Margaret S. Odell, "Ezekiel Saw What He Said He Saw: Genres, Forms, and the Vision of Ezekiel 1," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism*, 163.

In Demarcation and Structure, I will define the passage, showing its beginning and ending, and provide my rationales for the decision in demarcation such as change of topic, speaker, addressee, setting, genre, or syntax. My rationales will be presented with two principles: exclusion and inclusion. By the principle of exclusion, my demarcation shows how previous and subsequent pericopes are distinct from the current pericope while, by the principle of inclusion or coherence, the current unit shows how it can stand as an independent unit with its coherent subject, place, time, speaker, addressee, or other syntactic inner-connections. Discussion of the relationship between a smallest sub-unit and larger units naturally leads interpreters to make their own structures based on their understandings of the linguistic and literary outlines. As suggested in my use of the term pericope, the pericope/"passage" here refers to the sub-unit or the smallest unit, which is unable to be divided further at the semantic level. For example, Ezek. 48:8-22 is the *terumah* section, the holy dedicated area to YHWH. Although these 14 verses belong to the larger unit of the distribution of the land (47:21-48:35) and to the final vision (chs. 40-48), the semantic and syntactic analysis should focus on this specific sub-unit, "passage," since it is the core prescription of the City in terms of topographical relationship between the temple and other parts of the land. Indeed, the passage Ezek. 48:8-22 satisfies both exclusion and inclusion principles in demarcation. Meanwhile, for the formal structural understanding of the text, the structure of the entire independent unit of Ezekiel 8-11 will be presented in the Formal Structure in Chapter 6.

In this Demarcation and Structure, I will occasionally make critical notes regarding gaps I find for the later discussion of the synchronic and diachronic dimensions of the text. The detailed structural analysis of the relevant texts—defining their limits and outlining their content—will

appear under the Structure section, and the outlining of their content in the overall formal structure will be provided at the end of the chapter.

In discussing Structure, the present study attempts to consider form and content factors equally importantly because form and content go hand-in-hand. This attitude will be visible in my interpretation as I seriously consider the formal features (e.g., repeated sentences like "The Spirit lifted me up," or "He brought me") only when these produce significant meanings with the change of contents. In other words, in determination of the driving formal features for assessment of the literary structure of the text, following factors should be considered all together: formulaic language such as "Thus says YHWH", motifs, and various settings.[97] For example, the repeated clause "and he measured" in Ezek. 40:8-9 seems not to make any noticeable division; thus it should be excluded in the formal consideration. By doing so, my structure will avoid the motive-driven structure as well as the rigid application of the typical and generic genre driven structure, both of which were often found in the early form critical analyses.[98]

Sometimes, interpreters cannot ignore the explicit seams of the text when they read the text; and sometimes those discoveries would bother their synchronic reading and induce readers' exploration of the history of the text in its compositional growth.

Nonetheless, as Knierim advised, this study will keep the process of the exegesis: synchronic approach comes first and then examination of the textual seams in consultation with plausible historical settings. Knierim's interests of shifting from the surface level of the text to the concept of the text have been further advanced by Sweeney, whose work still emphasizes the

---

[97] Sweeny, "Form Criticism," 69.

[98] Gunkel's works are often criticized as the former case while Westermann's works are questioned by later critics as the too much rigid application of the genre or formula in making the structure.

final form both at the beginning and ending of the study of the text, even when the interpreters take into account the diachronic dimensions in various settings.[99]

Accordingly, with the critical appreciation of the diachronic exegetes' works, this study focuses more on the aftermath matter, i.e., I would like to synthesize the temporarily torn texts, the result of the diachronic analysis. Paying the equal attention to the original author's intention and to the final redactor's intentions, now I would like to assess how and in what situations the structure and the understanding of the text in terms of synchronic analysis would be influenced. In other words, how diachronic examinations would influence to the first synchronic understanding of the text and the consultations of the structure making and vice versa. This heuristic approach to reading the text should be explicitly practiced in advanced form critical interpretation.

If Zimmerli in his Ezekiel 8-11 study attempted to seek the oldest or older text from various possible redactional layers,[100] Greenberg did his best to keep the holistic reading of the text, even in Ezekiel 8-11.[101] As a later redaction-critical exegete generation, Hiebel studies to pursue the redaction history of the vision account in order to see the interrelatedness among the

---

[99] Sweeney, "Formation and Form in Prophetic Literature," in *Old Testament Interpretation: Past Present, and Future: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker*, ed. James Luther Mays, David L. Petersen and Kent Harold Richards (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 115. Sweeney's principle is practiced in his studies of the book of Zephaniah, the book of Habakkuk, the book of Nahum, the book of Hosea, and the book of Ezekiel. Sweeney, "A Form-Critical Reassessment of the Book of Zephaniah," *CBQ* 53 (1991): 388-408; idem, "Structure, Genre, and Intent in the Book of Habakkuk," *VT* 41 (1991): 63-83; idem, "Concerning the Structure and Generic Character of the Book of Nahum," *ZAW* 104 (1992): 364-77; idem, "A Form-Critical Reading of Hosea," *JHebS* 2 (1998): 1-16; idem, *Reading Ezekiel* (Smyth & Hwelet, 2012).

[100] Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 216-64.

[101] Greenberg, "Vision of Jerusalem in Ezekiel 8-11," 143-64.

visions and the theological meanings.[102] Then, my study examines the interrelationship between synchronic and diachronic fruits.

The present text is neither the only work of the original author nor the only work of the later redactors. It cannot be attributed to only one group; nobody can assert this. The text has been changed from the original that the original author had written; also, the later redactors might not have thought much about the reading effect which I, a 21century reader, appreciate now, when they inserted the specific words, phrases, sentences, or even blocks. These works with the traces of the textual seams appear as the gap, or guidance to lead the reader's interests to the diachronic approach.

Now, it is the reader, especially I as one of the readers of the text who does her best to understand and appreciate the text. In my reading, the two author groups' works are fully arising with other intertextual readings. My diachronic reading will be very restricted since I will pay attention only to the point where the present form shows the characteristic of *incompatibility*; that is, the reader inevitably makes the author group fool if one still keeps the synchronic approach. Hence, it necessitates a second thought to solve this conflict which introduces the diachronic world. Once I identify some phrases as later insertion, that confirmation frees the related verse from the formal structure outline; with the mark of the insertion head, that phrase will get freedom to move freely out of or into the structure within which it belongs to in synchronic reading. This diachronic discussion will be reflected on my thematic structure as an alternative reading in this study rather than reconstructing the formal structure of the present form.

2) Genre and Languages

---

[102] Hiebel, *Interrelatedness Vision Narratives*.

In Genre and Language, I set the goal to discover the overall genre of the text. Being inspired by Muilinburg's rhetorical concerns in communication, Roy Melugin emphasizes the unique features of individual texts even when the interpreters seek the typical form and usages of the language.[103]

With the help of structural analysis, I will enumerate the possible sub-genres and look for the relationship between sub-genres as well as their relationship with the overall genre. Questions will include: how shall the interpreter determine the overall genre from the dominant genres and several dominant genres from the marginalized ones; what shall be the criteria in selecting dominant genres? Should we follow some typicality which various formulae show; to what degree can we consider the potential influence of the small voices or hidden structures on the surface-level reading?

Language examination will also help to determine the various genres of the text because languages usually show the social settings in which they are situated. Syntactic and semantic analysis in the previous section, Structure, will work again in this investigation. In other words, language examination in this study will not be limited to only observing several vocabularies such as dispute language, court language, etc., but will be extended to thinking about their literary contexts, too. Repetition or *Wiederaufnahme* (resumptive repetition) and the possible performative dimensions will also become important topics. As Knierim argues, we should have flexible and three-dimensional understanding of genres, settings, and their relationships.[104]

Carol Newsom's view on genre offers many helpful tips: "Texts may participate in more than one genre, just as they may be marked in an exaggerated or in a deliberately subtle fashion."

---

[103] Roy F. Melugin, "Recent Form Criticism Revisited in an Age of Reader Response," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism*, 47.

[104] Knierim, *Text and Concept in Leviticus 1:1-9.*

With this attitude, Newsom emphasizes the importance of finding the "rhetorical strategies of the text."[105]

This recognition of multiple layers of author group and reader group naturally has led interpreters to consider the communication matter more seriously. Thus, based on the communicative theory, Sweeney and Ben Zvi encourage form critics to become multitaskers in their interpretations to uncover typicality and uniqueness, stability and fluidity, and historical and synchronic presentations.[106] One can apply this advice in reading the book of Ezekiel: the book of Ezekiel shows a very strong desire to control any counter-voices throughout the book. The most typical and frequent counter-voices are the elders of Israel as the representative of the house of Israel. As mentioned, unfortunately, they are never allowed to participate in the dialogue between Ezekiel and YHWH. They are in most cases the object/topic of the dialogue and very rarely play as an interlocutor. In the advanced form critical analysis, the interpreter would take heed to listen to their voices not only within the quoted framework but also their hidden voices beyond the scenes through reasonable imaginations.

3) Settings

Regarding presentation of the socio-historical setting of the text, the problem is that we do not know the specific and accurate date and background of the social setting at the time of original composition and later redactional times; rather we must be satisfied with the tantalizing conjectures. In other words, how can we estimate possible specific historical settings when we read the given text, which only implies the several stages of redaction behind the text? Sweeney answers with the conviction that since the book is in definition a composite work along with the

---

[105] Carol A. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imagination* (New York: Oxford University, 2003), 12.

[106] Sweeney and Ben Zvi, eds. *The Changing Face of Form Criticism*, Introduction, 9-10.

several stages of redaction, each specific historical setting must have a somewhat corresponding specific and concrete agenda, regardless of modern readers' accessibility to it.[107] If this is true, then searching for the possible agenda should be one of our goals in interpretation. Nonetheless, the problem, as Sweeney points out, lies in the fact that the accessibility of the modern reader to those socio-historical settings is not guaranteed. In other words, it implies that we modern readers may never reach those clear pictures of socio-historical settings. Heuristically, this gives a very dark shadow to interpreters. Thomas Römer points out this disappointment in his Deuteronomistic history study that the problem lies in our assumption that once we can identify a unique form of the text, we can get the key to restore the "*Sitz im Leben*" of the text. Römer continues to say that this assumption might constantly frustrate interpreters because we cannot get "a comprehensive sociological picture of 'Israel'."[108] Melugin also points out the

commentators' recent tendency of de-emphasis on redaction-historical questions, which is due to the problem of locating the plausible historical setting of the text.[109] Thus, I still remain in the position maintaining suspicion to make myself be cautious in applying even plausible historical settings to the specific text. Sweeney's attention to the *Sitz in der Literatur* may aid interpreters in avoiding "the literary dissection of a prophetic book," based on the mechanical application of the historical and social settings.[110] In this context, Sweeney is correct that our interests should be to see how each smallest sub-unit serves in making the structure and in manifesting the intention of the book of Ezekiel as whole.[111]

---

[107] Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39*, 39-41.

[108] Römer, "Form criticism and So Called Deuteronomistic History," 242.

[109] Melugin, "Recent Form Criticism," 53.

[110] Sweeney, "Formation and Form in Prophetic Literature," 115.

[111] Sweeney, *Reading Ezekiel*, 1-22.

The tentative solution which I employ in the present study is to set up the "flexible" plural settings by making the various probable reader groups *equally important*. These different tables invite different imaginable communities, which will open the reader response criticism as well as the way to come back to synchronic reading. For example, let us think about the literary settings and historical settings from the comparison of the visions in the book of Ezekiel. Visions in Ezekiel 1-3 and in chapters 8-11 have their deliverance form as "I said all to them," while visions in chapters 37, 38-39, and 40-48 do not show any deliverance report form. As the former takes the judgment oracle, readers—not audience in this case—would experience the tragic reality in triple folds: first in the textual presentation in the vision or in the divine command from YHWH to the prophet; second, in the delivered report form, i.e., "Thus I told all I saw to them"; and third in the fulfilment report of that prophecy, such as appeared in chapter 33, the fall of Jerusalem. Nonetheless, in the latter visions, which deal with so called restoration, audience as well as readers can hardly get the sense of any reality due to the lack of delivering report and fulfillment report as the narrative form. These contrasting phenomena in the literary setting would lead interpreters to conjecture that both forms would fit well in the exilic social setting. In the exilic situation, the exiles, the implied literary audience, may have felt the prophecies and visions concerning further judgment on their nation very clearly, while the restoration cannot be presented with clarity about its time and manner. This may work as an internal evidence of the exilic composition of the text by which interpreters can argue this uncertainty and indeterminacy of the time of restoration is the faithful reflection of author's situation in exile.

However, the study of setting should not end here. The setting would also be well fitting for the postexilic readers for whom the goal of the ideal society is not yet reached. By drawing the restoration picture in a timeless setting, the postexilic community might be able to keep

themselves from frustration after their return to the land of Israel. Always, better things will come tomorrow!

Ben Zvi's work is impressive for this discussion. In his FOTL commentary on Micah, he emphasizes the book of Micah as a written material which should be read holistically. Ben Zvi's application of reader's setting is especially insightful for this study. There, he proposes the reader's setting as a postexilic era even though the superscription of the book clearly shows its monarchic setting. The reason he can separate these two settings, literary and readerial, lie in his conviction. Ben Zvi believes that ancient readers who might become the later author group lived in a different historical setting from the world portrayed within the text. As a result, the ancient readers did not read the text mimetically, but rather read the text as a text that they used to speak to and about their own situation.[112]

4) Interpretation

As Melugin argues, form critics in the new century should encounter the "immensity of interpreter's role in the making of meaning."[113] Thus, instead of using the term "Intention" as classical form critics pursue, the present study uses "Interpretation" as Sweeney uses in his form critical commentaries. In this interpretation section, various sets of intertextual readings will be presented in an effort to synthesize the study as much as it allows.

2.2 Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is a way of reading. According to Jeffrey Reed, it is a "framework with which the analyst approaches a text and explicates what it says and how it has been said, in

---

[112] Ehud Ben Zvi, *Micah*, FOTL 21B (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 5-12.

[113] Melugin, "Recent Form Criticism," 61.

addition to what has been understood and how it has been understood."[114] With its premise of the text as discourse, i.e., the communicative event, the subjects of analysis extend from speakers, listeners, texts, etc., to all the communicants involved in communication. In detail, the term "discourse" refers to "(1) the linguistic units surrounding a sentence (context), (2) the immediate situation (context of situation), and (3) the wider cultural background of the text (context of culture)."[115]

2.2.1 General definitions of the discourse analytical terms

Any narrative work can be viewed as a communication between a sender and a receiver. Based on this simple fact, this section attempts to answer various questions in respect to the communicative elements of the first temple vision by reading that text as a narrative discourse. Despite the broad umbrella of the discourse analysis, applying their terms to the biblical exegesis, especially to the book of Ezekiel, is not a simple task, for there are sources which need to be modified. Several factors even broaden the distance/gap between modern literature oriented analysis and the book of Ezekiel as an ancient sacred book. First, modern literary terms and concepts are not much concerned about the plural authorship which ancient documents like Hebrew Bible have due to its long term history of composition and transmission and thick layers of readership. Ben Zvi notes that "dehistoricization and generalization" of the prophetic books by reading and rereading would be the natural outcome of the reading.[116] These trans-generational

---

[114] Jeffery T. Reed, *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate Over Literary Integrity*. JSNTSup 136 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 16.

[115] Reed, *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians*,16. For relevant works in these fields, see Michael Stubbs*, Discourse Analysis: Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983), 12.

[116] Ehud ben Zvi, "The Prophetic Book: A Key Form of Prophetic Literature," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism*, 289.

participations have several significances. First, like other ancient texts which show the compositional growth history, we have diachronic issues about the multiple implied authorships and readerships. Often we modern readers can perceive the different authorial intentions or even disputations between the original author group and later redactor groups even before viewing textual seams they left behind. Second, the Bible has many re-readers. Certainly, sacred texts like the Hebrew Bible were written for different implied readers: the first time readers and the re-readers after them. For example, Ezekiel's two throne visions in chapter 1 and 10 are apparently designed to be read and re-read to catch the complete meaning, mainly due to its gradual revelation of the objects. As Brian Richardson points out, the first reading gives readers the amazement of discovery while the second reading provides them the joy of recognition of the nuances of the text.[117] Third, narratology terms above including narrator, reader, or narratee are best fitted for the genre of narrative, but the book of Ezekiel is not a typical biblical narrative but belongs to the classical prophetic literature. Harry Peter Nasuti also points out that prophetic books may contain narrative elements and even extended narratives, but with the exception of the book of Jonah, they are not primarily narrative texts in the same way as Genesis or Ruth.[118] And fourth, Ezekiel 8-11 is not even a typical prophecy, but is a dramatic vision narrative or a vision report by the first person narrator-character. Despite all these obstacles, discourse analysis will enhance our reading of Ezekiel 8-11 because it shows many complicated issues regarding the sender, receiver, and intention of the text. This reading theory and communication matter have not been seriously treated in the traditional literary analysis on the book of Ezekiel.

---

[117] Brian Richardson, "Singular text, Multiple Implied Readers," *Style* 41 (2007): 7.

[118] Harry Peter Nasuti, *Defining the Sacred Songs: Genre, Tradition, and the Post-Critical Interpretation of the Psalms,* JSOTSup 218 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 47.

Now, with this awareness, let us think about the communication matter. In general, a narrative with one explicit speaker or writer can have three sender-receiver pairs: narrator and narratee, implied author and implied reader, real author and real reader. Among these pairs, only the real author and the real reader exist outside the textual world. Both the implied author/implied reader and the narrator/narratee pairs can be recognized through the narrative text. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of these concepts in interpretation of Ezekiel 8-11, let us first define several terms including "narrative."

2.2.2 Narratological Terms for the Text applications

2.2.2.1 Narrative

Several contemporary narratologists have defined "narrative" in terms of the communication matter. Manfred Jahn defines it as "a form of communication which presents a sequence of events caused and experienced by characters."[119] James Phelan's rhetorical theory leads him to suggest that narrative has three distinct axes in communication: "the axis of facts and events, the axis of ethics, and the axis of knowledge and perception."[120] Gerald Prince broadens its definition to "a mode of verbal presentation which involves the linguistic recounting or telling of events."[121] According to these definitions, the first temple vision in the book of Ezekiel is qualified enough to fit in a subgenre of narrative.

---

[119] Manfred Jahn, *Narratology: A Guide to the Theory of Narrative* (University of Cologne, 2005). Retrieved from http://www.uni-koeln.de/~ame02/pppn.htm; see also H. Porter Abbot's Introductory monograph for general terminologies in narratology. H. Porter Abbot, *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative,* 2nd edition (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, [2002] 2008).

[120] James Phelan, *Living to Tell About It: A Rhetoric and Ethics of Character Narration* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), 80.

[121] Gerald Prince, *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982), 155; also see Gérard Genette's study on Boundaries of Narrative. Gérard Genette and Ann Levonas, "Boundaries of Narrative," *New Literary History* 8, no. 1 (1976): 1-13.

Then, we will move to our main discussion terms, discussing the sender group first: who recounts the events and how?

2.2.2.2 Sender Group

2.2.2.2.1 Narrator

The narrator tells a story. Unlike the implied author, who is behind the text, the narrator stands within the text as a storyteller and interpreter of events. To avoid the potential confusion, I would like to clarify my expression; the "narrator's standing within the text" does not mean that he is involved in the story, as we expect it from the homodiegetic or first-person narrator. Rather, that expression emphasizes the distinction between the narrator and the implied author that the narrator sends direct signals to the readers to show his existence while the implied author cannot show his bare face at any time.

In the biblical exegetical field, Simon Bar-Efrat emphasizes the existence of the narrator in the text, compared to other sister arts like drama.[122] According to Gérard Genette, narrator is the speaker or "voice" of the narrative discourse. As an agent "who establishes communicative contact with addressee (the narratee)," the the author lets the narrator use the controlling power in determination of exposition and hiddenness as well as the manners of revelation.[123]

In terms of "voice," however, I would rather be careful in using the term. Voice is very closely associated with focalization, the sensibility through which we see the characters and events in the story, and is sometimes hard to distinguish from it. Accordingly, in my understanding, we can hear various voices during the reading time: from the narrator, implied author, character, implied audience, and even ourselves as real readers.

---

[122] Simon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible.* JSOTSup 70, Bible and Literature Series 17 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 13.

[123] Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse,* 35.

To examine the narrative situations in Ezekiel 8-11, we need a further classification of the narrator since there are more than one narrator, though apparently we assume to have only one kind of narrator, i.e., first-person narrator Ben Adam. Seymour Chatman distinguishes the overt narrator from the covert narrator.[124] The overt narrator shows his existence explicitly when leading the narrative. He makes editorial omniscience by inserting various comments about the characters and events, even by stopping the flow of the events. We see this phenomenon occasionally in the DtrH's editorial comments, for example, in the evaluation of the northern Israel kings who get the label "sins of Jeroboam." Likewise, the tools often used by an overt narrator are, self-reference, acknowledgement of "a reader-addressee, and a 'metanarrative comment', i.e. a reflection on the nature of storytelling itself." While these signs are conspicuous and easy to catch, the covert narrators are indistinct or indeterminable, largely, fading into the background.[125] With the covert narrator, perceptions of events sometimes hold accord with one of the characters. In many cases, where we find the word "behold" *(hinneh)*[126] in the first temple vision text, the narrator shows us a certain detail from the point of view of one of the characters. Thus, in the first temple vision analysis, I will often attribute this mark to the character Ben Adam's perception rather than to the narration of Ben Adam the narrator.

Narrator/Reporter:

As mentioned before, the book of Ezekiel does not have serious issues regarding the narrator since it is mostly presented by the first-person narrator-character Ben Adam throughout the whole book. In the final vision (chs. 40-48), for example, we have one narrator, presented as

---

[124] Seymour Benjamin Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978), 219-25.

[125] Jahn, *Narratology.*

[126] Francis I. Andersen calls this type of clause as a surprise clause. Francis I. Andersen, *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew* (The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1974), 94-96.

the first-person singular. But in the whole book, the text shows the shift of the narrator's pronoun before the main story starts (1:1 as "I" and 1:2-3 as an anonymous narrator introduces the character Ezekiel). Diachronically speaking, this double introduction itself shows that this book was handed down by at least more than one pen in its very early compositional stage. In fact, this phenomenon is not unique in the book of Ezekiel; also, in the book of Jeremiah and the book of Isaiah, these two kinds of narrators are not hard to find. The difference is that the shift happened more frequently in those books so that readers can become aware of the existence of this heterodeigetic narrator in addition to the homodiegetic narrator. In the case of the book of Ezekiel, however, this heterodeigetic narrator is much more self-effacing, so that he appears in the superscription-like introduction of the book and then disappears until surprisingly he reappears in the first temple vision in Ezekiel 9 to report the destruction of Jerusalem in a proleptic manner. I will deal with this matter in detail in the Structure of Ezekiel 9, but it is good to mention here as the example of the existence of 3rd person narrator in the book of Ezekiel.

Now, within the framework of anonymous heterodiegetic narration, we readers may enter the story with the first person narrator, whose name is Ezekiel according to the superscription-like information, but who is most often called the very generic name "Ben Adam" by YHWH, another main character.

This homodiegetic narrator starts his story in a very overt manner. Since the narrator is in the story, and very actively participates in the first part of the book, we can list his characteristics more. He lived with his wife in a specific place that can accommodate several elders, and had a fellow exilic community as his social network. He associated with the elders of the exile. He knew various priestly instructions (he resisted when YHWH commanded him to use human dung as fuel for food) and kept applying those regulations strictly. He knew some of the religious

60

personnel in Jerusalem (in the Jerusalem vision, he recognized Pelatiah son of Benaiah being killed).

Compared to the final vision, this first temple vision shows Ben Adam's active reactions throughout the tour and contains the report of the vision to the elders of Judah in Babylon at the end. Contrastingly, in the narrative situation of the final temple vision, this overt first-person narrator yields his space gradually to the anonymous covert character Bronze Man, and eventually the vision report almost loses its narrativity to the bare divine speeches.[127]

Regarding the narrator, spectator, and main character relationship, the final vision shows an interesting presentation among its several characters. The Bronze Man-angelic guide, and Ben Adam-the spectator were together until the last scene of the journey, when they see the waters from the temple basis. Both characters seem to stand as shadows on the stage. Even when they are still waiting for the next station for the tour on the stage,[128] whenever YHWH starts speaking, the spotlight falls only upon YHWH. There is no single set of dialogue among three characters. So, from this perspective, the official/surface level narrator is the first person narrator-character Ben Adam; however, he is more likely the device to become anybody placed in his position. Davis in fact points out that this phenomenon is a very subtle strategy to invite readers' participation to imitate the narrator-character-spectator Ben Adam. She calls this strategy as "establishing a partnership."[129] Since very ancient books show very modern/postmodern novel-

---

[127] Here, the term "narrativity" refers to the sense of the existence of narrator. Thus, losing its narrativity means that the some part of the story is not in control of the narrator. As we will see, the book of Ezekiel has this peculiar ending from 48:29 up to the end of the book, 48:35.

[128] The term "stage" is broadly used in the narrative analysis to refer to the narrative space rather than the actual theatrical space.

[129] Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll*, Chapter 4, "Making an Audience," 73-105.

like characteristics (James Joyce is not the first one of this type of text, then), narratology should ponder a new notion to explain this phenomenon.

2.2.2.2.2 Implied Author

Paul House in his Zephaniah study defines the implied author as "the writer pictured by the reader."[130] Although we can understand the context of his definition, in the narratology circle, the term "writer" may bring too much weight on the agent of the comparison. Several scholars of this field have already shown the impersonalizing tendency of the implied author. Wayne Booth, the inventor of this term, illustrates the implied author as "an ideal, literary, created version of the real man."[131] Chatman describes it as "the source of the narrative text's whole structure of meaning."[132] Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan also redefines the term as a "de-personified" construction built by the reader's inference and imagination, i.e., not as an anthropomorphic entity.[133] Mieke Bal goes even further, saying that "the implied author is the result of the investigations of the meaning of a text, and not the source of that meaning."[134] Synthesizing this broad spectrum of the concepts of the implied reader, I would like to set up the implied author of the first temple vision of the book of Ezekiel as the expressed desires of the Babylonian exilic community in the 6th century BCE.

---

[130] Paul R. House, *Zephaniah: A Prophetic Drama*, Bible and Literature Series 16 (Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 82.

[131] Wayne Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1961), 70-71.

[132] Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 147.

[133] Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (London: Methuen, 2002), 87-89.

[134] Mieke Bal, "The Laughing Mice-or: On Focalization," *Poetics Today* 2, no. 2 (1981): 209.

This implied author as expressed desires can be logically traced, not only from the explicit narrator information, but also from the implied interests of the author group. The examples include the critical evaluation of the elder group and the Shaphan family in 11:1-13 and the different treatment between Levites and the Levitical priests of the family of Zadok in 43:18-19 and 44:8-16. In addition to the clear interests of the specific group, the final vision deals with the new temple and the new restored society, based on the priestly-centered community, as if the condemnation of the old temple in Ezekiel 8-11 was also based on the abominations from the ritualistic apostasies. All these are the reflection of the expressed desires of the community, i.e., of the implied author.

Finally, I would like to discuss the singularity of the implied author and plurality of the real author group. Reading the Bible as biblical literature requires us to have understandings on both fields, the biblical exegetical world and the world of narratology. Each book of the Bible, including the book of Ezekiel, supposes the implied author as one person although the real authors are different. This tendency clearly comes from the influence of the narrative analysis on the modern literary works. Literary critics focus to examine the coherence of the text. Even though the world of the Bible is radically different from the modern fictional world at this point, so far, many biblical scholars in the narratology field appear ignorant about the existence of the multi-voicing implied authors; thus, these scholars have adopted the theory without critical reflections. In the narratology field, if conflict or even lack of coherence appears in the narrative, the literary work is regarded as a poor one. However, the biblical narrative should be treated differently as we should consider the diachronic issues in this matter.

In other words, several real authors (including the redactors) had written several scrolls, which eventually were collected into one book, the book of Ezekiel. One of the fruits of this

collection is that we readers now appreciate both the historical, compositional layers as well as the synthesis of the collection as one corpus. This can be applied even to the book of Isaiah. The result of the composition of the book of Ezekiel has two implications: 1) unity of the implied author is hard to expect in the biblical discourse analysis; 2) elusiveness of the real author becomes much more serious in our field because interpreters at least want to know the historical settings of their text. In this regard, Patrick Hogan suggests a new term, "implicated" author, by distinguishing the "one globally implied author" from "many locally implicated authors."[135] The striking feature of implicated authorship is that it entails different sorts of continuity and discontinuity. The highest level of continuity is encompassed in the implied author. But implicated authorial views also exist from various patterns of coherence and contradiction on their own.

Ezekiel scholarship has distinguished the different pens of the pre-fall Jerusalem and post-fall Jerusalem with the marking of chapter 33, as we have seen in the earlier diachronic discussion section. Judgment and restoration are the popular standards for this division. As a very cautious attempt, I propose that the book of Ezekiel might have at least two implied author groups and two implied reader groups, incorporated into a single text. The first pair would be the Ezekiel in the exile and his contemporaries, while the second pair would be those who remembered Ezekiel in the postexilic period and their contemporaries.[136] Although I will mainly focus on the first pair as explicitly presented in the text, I will also consider applying this "implicated authors" notion if the text obviously shows the seams of the different authorships.

---

[135] Patrick Colm Hogan, *Narrative Discourse: Authors and Narrators in Literature, Film, and Art* (Ohio: The Ohio State University, 2013), 113-49; 252.

[136] Cf. Zimmerli's "Ezekiel school" concept regarding the homogeneous editorial layers. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 68-77.

2.2.2.2.3 Real author

Readers and scholars do not know the real author; even in the world of modern fictions, real authors are not exposed to the readers through the text. We do not even know how many authors we should include in our "real author" discussion, from amongst the candidates of initial composition, transmission, redaction, compilation, and translation. This is the extra-textual world that we cannot reach in full. From the glance at the existence of the ancient scribe like Baruch in the book of Jeremiah, nobody can guarantee that the real author who got the vision in the book of Ezekiel was the writer of the text in Hebrew, although it is very unlikely to think "Ezekiel" was illiterate and employed a scribe due to his inability to write.

Obscured historical reconstruction of the ancient text which has a long redaction history also makes us frustrated in searching for even a single focused implied author. We do not know in what situation the text was written and read. As mentioned, redactors are not simply mechanistic editors; they are authors in their own redactional works. Consequently, the present form of the prophetic literature reflects the redactors' understandings of the prophetic message, which may or may not be the same as that of the earlier authors or prophets whose works appear within the book. This search for the real author involves a thorough study with the diachronic perspective at its methodological center; for my study, the amount of the diachronic discussion in the Introduction is satisfactory. In the following two chapters (Chapters 3 and 4), this diachronic research will be limitedly presented in the discussion of the historical settings.

2.2.2.3 Receiver Group:

Besides the original meaning intended from the speakers, listeners/readers' comprehensions and reactions are also a study subject of discourse analysis since, as Jeffrey T. Reed expresses, "communication is not one-way entertainment." Thus, despite the non-presence

of the listener in the monologue, every discourse fundamentally assumes audience of any kind and so their reactions of any kind.[137]

In most cases, readers assume that the communication has the targeted listeners as others not as the speakers themselves, and the intention of the speaker should be delivered to the implied audience. But, sometimes this assumption on the general communication ends with frustration. This results in difficulties, as Sweeney points out, "since what is meant is not always what is understood. And yet this does not prevent the listener/reader from trying his/her best guess." The irony of this communication between the sender and the receiver lies in their miscommunication. If readers as redactioners also participate in this communication traffic, the close analysis should be essential.[138] In particular, redactioners-readers can easily tend to wield the power to "correct" their understanding when encountering unconceivable messages to their knowledge; since they cannot meet the sender of the message at their times of reading.

Thus, the receiver group of discourse analysis in biblical studies has many, complex layers in it; and so the concerning matters such as the primary message of the discourse, the contextual information like knowledge, situation, etc. about participants , the responses invoked by the messages, all become complicated with many diverse recipients of the discourse assumed. Hence, in the study of the receiver group and multiple interpretations, the more significant is the "why" and "how" part than "what" being suggested. Most importantly, the communicative process of biblical texts cannot allow losing its grip of any relevant group involved in speaker/author and listener/reader.

---

[137] Jeffrey T. Reed, "Discourse Analysis as New Testament Hermeneutic: A Retrospective and Prospective Appraisal," *JETS* 39, no. 2 (1996): 230.

[138] Sweeney, "Form criticism," 82.

2.2.2.3.1 Audience

Peter Rabinowitz distinguishes several terms regarding audience. The actual audience is "the flesh-and-blood people who read the book" (the author has no control over this group) and the authorial audience is the "hypothetical audience" assumed by the author. When acknowledging Rabinowitz in notion of authorial audience as in a close tie with authorial intention—because they do not resist author's pre-social setting in their reading, this authorial audience, in my understanding, is often correspondent to the implied/authorial readers in a written literary work. According to Rabinowitz's definition, the narrative audience is "truly a fiction" so that the author encourages his real audience to follow this fictional group.[139] In my study, this narrative audience group is often defined as the literary audience who exists on the stage of the narrative and therefore should also be treated as characters. The interlocutor group, the elders of Judah in 8:1, is a good example of this case.

2.2.2.3.2 Narratee

Narratee is the counterpart to narrator, just as real reader is to real author and implied reader to implied author. But, there is some uniqueness to the narratee. The real reader is not in fact addressed by the real author, whose limitation in time and space cannot know or envision exactly about even a fraction of the diverse reader groups. In contrast, the narratee is the addressee of the narrator. It is sometimes possible to infer a narratee from the information or attitudes presupposed by a narrator. The big difference of the narrative situation between Ezekiel 8-11 and 40-48 lies in the existence/absence of the overt narratee. In the first temple vision, the narratee is the elders of Judah who sat in Ben Adam's house in 8:1. Although no word is given to them either regarding the question (8:1) or the response to the presumably delivered divine

---

[139] Peter Rabinowitz, "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences," *Critical Inquiry* 4, no. 1 (1977): 130.

oracle in the vision form (11:25), the elders of Judah exist as the overt narratee and as a character. On the contrary, in Ezekiel 40-48, we do not have an overt narratee before the character Ben Adam enters into the vision world. Except for 43:10-11, in which YHWH commanded Ben Adam to deliver all the styles and regulations of the new temple to the house of Israel, the final vision report does not have any designated literary audience as narratee. Here, we should not be confused by the immediate pronoun "you," whether singular or plural, in the divine speech as the narratee of the final vision. The "you"s in YHWH's speeches, including kings, Levites, and the house of Israel in general, are to be understood as accents of the performativity of the divine oracles which the book of Ezekiel also follows as part of the earlier prophetic traditions.

The important thing for the discussion of Ezekiel 40-48 is that the text shows the possible case in which the narratee can be or include the objectified self of the first-person narrator himself if the narrative employs forms of vision or dream. We will see the dynamic transformation of the narratee and its literary and theological meanings in Part III. In the prophetic literature, which often exposes its performativity, narratee can be analogous to the literary audience or immediate audience, whereas implied reader is analogous to the targeted reader.[140]

2.2.2.3.3 Implied reader

If "the Implied Author" is Booth's coinage, "Implied Reader" was introduced by Wolfgang Iser, who emphasizes the pre-structuring concept of the implied reader in revealing the potential meaning of the text. According to Iser, this implied reader (implied audience) is not necessarily "you" or "I" as the real reader or the narratee, but the reader we infer to be an

---

[140] This distinction is clearly manifested in the book of Deuteronomy, where the literary audience as the fictional audience must be the wilderness generation who were about to enter the land while the targeted implied readers might be those who were born in the Promised Land.

intended recipient of the narrative.[141] In sum, the implied reader is the reader the implied author writes for.

But the real problem lies in identifying the implied reader group in the biblical text, as we experience difficulty in searching for the implied author of the text. Brian Richardson suggests making a spectrum in which we construct an image to model the range of implied readers including "undivided single authorial audience," and "dual audiences," which can be applied to the reader and the re-reader of the text, if the activity occurs in reading instead of listening.[142] Agreeing to Richardson's challenge to the traditional notion of the single implied reader, I will apply Roland Barthes' notion of the text in understanding authorship and readership of our text. According to Barthes, the text is given to the reader not as the source of full information but as "fragmented and disjointed material." In this situation, readers should determine the meanings moment by moment of their readings to overcome the prevalent indeterminations of the text.[143] This process, in my understanding, is the reader's efforts to consult the cohesive understanding and the appreciation of the text. By putting both sides into perspective, Barthes provides the interpreter with a way to strike a balance weighing between the sender and receiver. Barthes' encouragement to the reader's participation can become more fruitful when we think of the performative dimension of the prophetic literature which requires us to think its performing times (relevant to the historical and social settings) and its audiences (relevant to the reader's setting).

---

[141] Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 34. Also see Rimmon-Kenan, "Wolfgang Iser — in Memoriam," *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas* 5, no. 2 (2007): 141-44.

[142] Richardson, "Singular Text, Multiple Implied Readers," 379-81

[143] Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author," in *Image, Music, Text*, ed., Roland Barthes and Stephen Heath (New York: Hill & Wang, 1977), 142-48.

As Iser emphasizes indeterminacies and unformulated connections that a literary text engages in its readers,[144] Davis in her Ezekiel study also points out that "indeterminacy is the fundamental precondition for reader's participation." According to her, the writer's responsibility then is to establish the conditions for a collaborative relationship with the audience. This relationship becomes possible when the writer gives the readers or listeners sufficient acquisition on the text so that they can in turn exercise their creative responsibility in producing a coherent and to some degree personal reading.[145] If this is the ideal reading process, we should be able to read the prevailed indeterminacy and vagueness in the book of Ezekiel as the intended strategy of the author group to reduce the distance between the implied author and implied reader.

Overall, the book of Ezekiel starts with the overt narrator with the clear superscription but ends with the covert narrator, an almost transparent spectator in the final vision. Although most prophets and some of Ezekiel's roles in the book are called messengers, Ezekiel's role in the final vision (40-48) is not limited to being the messenger, but also includes being the spectator and the scribe. Emphasizing Ezekiel's scribal role in the vision, Renz points out that the vision report as a script expects readers to internalize and experience the messages from Ezekiel, as though the prophet "ate" the scroll (2:9-3:3).[146] In his "Vision of the Valley" analysis, Michael Fox also pays attention to Ezekiel's role as spectator and argues that this spectator's position is employed from a very strategic plan to give the impression of objectivity to the

---

[144] Wolfgang Iser, "Indeterminacy and the Reader's Response," in *Aspects of Narrative: Selected Papers from the English Institute*, ed. J. H. Miller (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), 1-45.

[145] Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll*, 77.

[146] Renz, *Rhetorical Function of the Book of Ezekiel*, 18.

70

vision.[147] He also explains the situation of the next generation in the exile as those who neither

know about the homeland nor have experienced the trauma of the exile.[148]

The book of Ezekiel does not make an explicit distinction between earlier and later

generations within the exilic community; nonetheless, historical presentations of the Bible

regarding the exilic period (ca. 60 years from 597 B.C.E. King Jehoiachin's captivity to 536

B.C.E. King Cyrus' decree) suggest that the contemporaries of Ezekiel can hardly be identical

with the returnees in the book of Ezra-Nehemiah. If the year of the vision in 40:1 refers to

Ezekiel's twentieth year of ministry, then as Sweeney proposes, that year for Ezekiel is the time

for him to retire from his supposed priestly duty.[149] Encountering a hopeless daily life in

Babylon and encountering his time of retirement, Ezekiel/the author may be desperate to deliver

the Torah of the exile, the divine plan for the restoration.

In sum, the following points are made by the terms: 1) Real author and real reader in the

extra-textual level: "since author and reader do not communicate in the text itself, their level of

communication is an "extra-textual" one": a level of nonfictional communication.[150] An actual

reader always has the potentiality to take the position of the implied reader or resistant readers. 2)

Implied fictional communication in the immediate level: an implied author who is positioned

above the narrator in the text and an implied reader as a text's overall projection of a reader role;

3) Characters and narrators in intra-textual level: In the first temple vision (Ezekiel 8-11): (1) at

---

[147] Michal V. Fox, "Rhetoric of Ezekiel's Vision of the Valley of the Bones," *HUCA* 51 (1980): 8.

[148] Fox, "Rhetoric of Ezekiel's Vision of the Valley of the Bones," 11-12.

[149] Sweeney, *Tanak: A Theological and Critical Introduction to the Jewish Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 338.

[150] Jahn, Narratology.

the level of narrative discourse: first person character-narrator Ben Adam tells the whole story which he experiences in the vision to the elders of Judah in his exilic community; (2) at the level of the vision world: first person character-narrator Ben Adam tells "most" stories[151] which he experiences in the vision to the unspecified audience.

Now the leftover topics are what and how questions: what was sent through the vision, and how it was delivered to the receiver group. I will unpack these two topics in Part II.

2.2.2.4 Focalization

2.2.2.4.1 Basic Concepts and the Research Review

Coined by the French narrative theorist Gerard Genette, the term focalization refers to the perspective, position, or quality of consciousness through which the characters, events, and the narrative as a whole are presented. In his original conception, the focalization is associated "with a 'focal character' and the questions 'who sees?' and 'who perceives'."[152] However, Mieke Bal shows a different opinion that focalization should cover much wider scope beyond perception and argue that the narrator is a potential "focalizer," too.[153] Its function in the narrative involves disclosing or hiding information to display events or affairs from somebody's subjective point of view. It is the options and ranges of orientational restrictions of narrative presentation. Therefore, focalization is "the presentation of a scene through the subjective perception of a character."[154]

Emanuela Tegla explains internal and external focalizers respectively. The internal focalization is a presenting technique to use the lens of a character "inside" the story. "This

---

[151] A few exceptions on this delivery manner will be dealt in the Ezekiel 9 analysis in Chapter 4.

[152] Genette, *Narrative Discourse,* 40.

[153] Bal, "The Laughing Mice-or," 202-10.

[154] Benthan Benwell, James Procter, Gemma Robinson, "Introduction," in *Postcolonial Audiences: Readers, Viewers and Reception* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 6.

internal focalizer, or character-focalizer, participates in the diegesis, viewing the events from

within. On the contrary, the external focalizer is not a character participating in the diegetic

stream,"[155] analogous to the third-person narrator.

Genette criticizes the history of scholarship arguing that the confusion was made from

the questions of "who sees (subject of focalization)" and of "who speaks (subject of narration)."

Accordingly, he suggests that formerly designated "point of view" should be clarified as

"focalization." By doing so, he distinguishes the position from which the text is displayed

(Focalization) from the expressed viewpoint of the speaker (Point Of View). Going further, he

asserts that the focalizer is a chosen point rather than a person.[156]

According to this concept, in Ezekiel 24 for example, the narrator is the first person I and

experiences the death of his wife, but the point that is chosen for the narration (Focalizer) is the

character YHWH, or the anonymous narrator who introduces himself at the beginning of the

book. So the death is not at all viewed from the perspective of Ezekiel nor from the neighbor

exiles, but from the perception of YHWH. Then, intentionally, a gap is created and the purpose

of it is to enhance the understanding of the sudden tragedy. The gap establishes a space for the

exilic fellows within the narrative to be curious about and throw serious questions: why you do

not mourn; why you do not follow the typical custom; and why your wife should die.

Meanwhile, Bal and Rimmon-Kenan argue that both external (narrator) and internal

(character) focalizers as a dual are possible.[157] Since, in its definition, the focalizer alone decides

---

[155] Emanuela Tegla, *J. M. Coetzee and the Ethics of Power: Unsettling Complicity, and Confession* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 9.

[156] Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, 194-98.

[157] Mieke Bal and Christine Van Boheemen, *Narratology: Introduction to the theory of narrative*. 3rd ed. (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 2009). Originally published as *De theorie van vertellen en verhalen* (Muiderberg, The Netherlands: Coutinho, 1980), 142-43; Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, 74-82.

the narrative's standpoint, the fewer the number of the focalizers, the less diverse options the narrative text has in terms of its orientations of knowledge, reflections, cultural ideologies, etc.[158] Biwu Shang also challenges Genette's restriction of the focalization to the character as too much rigid application and argues that the narrator can be the focalizer.[159]

In analyzing Ezekiel 8-11, James Phelan's concept of restricted narration gives an important insight. Unlike Genette, Seymour Chatman and Gerald Prince, Phelan frees himself from the dogmatic distinction between story and discourse, or the strict distinction between the focalizer and the narrator. Phelan's argument is based on two logics. First, if narrators cannot perceive events in the story, implied readers, narratees, and flesh and blood readers also cannot perceive them since much of their access is dependent on the narrator. Second, if the perception of the events by the narrator is not possible, a human narrator cannot report a coherent sequence of the events.[160] For Phelan who has studied the character-narrator focalization in the postmodern narratology, restricted narration means the "narration that records events but does not interpret or evaluate them." [161] In the book of Ezekiel, the main narrator-character Ben Adam seldom interprets any event by recounting. The author completely restricts the function of

---

[158] Genette summarizes the history of discussion on the focalization as two main schools: Mieke Bal, Michael J. Toolan, Patrick O'Neil and Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, etc. as one school which shows the tendency of expansionof the focalization concept to cognitive, emotive, and ideological orientations; while Chatman as the representative of another school which shows doubt on the visible existence of focalization and suggests using the terms "slant," "center" and "interest focus" instead of focalization or POV. Present study takes the former school's terms. For the history of debate on the focalization, see, Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, 65-92; idem, *Narrative Discourse Revisited* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1988), Introduction.

[159] Biwu Shang, *In Pursuit of Narrative Dynamics: A Study of James Phelan's Rhetorical Theory of Narrative*, Europäische Hochschulschriften 463 (New York: Peter Lang, 2011), 165.

[160] Phelan, "Why Narrators Can be Focalizers—and Why it Matters," in *New Perspectives on Narrative Perspective*, ed. Willie van Peer and Seymour Benjamin Chatman (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001), 57.

[161] Phelan, *Living to Tell about It*, 29

the narrator in this restricted manner. All the tough critical comments either to the narratee and to the implied audience is made by YHWH. As we shall see, the effect of this strategy to the character Ben Adam is not insignificant since he can remain as a transparent agent to both parties, angry YHWH and frustrated captives. Shang explains this restriction as double meanings. First, the narrator is limited in the sense that he does not act on all three axes of communication. That is, the narrator only plays the role of a reporter but not an interpreter and evaluator. Second, it is the implied author who deliberately restricts the narrator from doing any interpreting and evaluating work, which are supposed to be conducted by the authorial audience.[162]

As Shang points out, with the concept of character-narrator, Phelan surpasses the traditional conception of homodiegetic narration.[163] Shang emphasizes the importance of Phelan's "narrator as focalizer" concept because it can help us recognize the possible existence of "dual-focalization," in which the narrator's focalization either entails the character's focalization or is parallel to the character's focalization.[164]

2.2.2.4.2 Examples from the book of Ezekiel

1) Storm and Throne Theophany in Ezekiel 1

In the first vision, the vision narrative is preceded by the word "What I see." Thus, no matter how objective or subjective, the vision report in chapter 1 is the place where the character-focalizer "I" saw and heard. When this is the case, the vision report has the identical focalizer-narrator. All through the first person account we are constantly reminded of the prophet's 1st person focalization of the experience: וָאֵרֶא ("and I saw") in vv. 4, 15, 27, and 28,

---

[162] Shang, *In Pursuit of Narrative Dynamics*, 104.

[163] Shang, *In Pursuit of Narrative Dynamics*, 107.

[164] Shang, *In Pursuit of Narrative Dynamics,* 171-73.

וָאֶשְׁמַע ("and I heard") in vv. 24 and 28. From a general apprehension of a cloud-like entity in v. 4, the vision proceeds from a description of the shape of the creatures in vv. 5-8, to a description of their interactive movement in vv. 9-14 and the curious wheel structures in vv. 15-21. The verbs of motion through v. 12a all refer to the internal movement of the entire object through the sky. When the object is moving closer to Ezekiel, the recognition becomes clearer as the vision progresses. Meanwhile, the verbs הָלַךְ and נָסַע indicate horizontal and vertical movements respectively throughout the vision. The movement stops suddenly at vv. 22-23 which have the depiction of a "firmament" or a platform, and the creatures covering themselves whose first appearance is mentioned here. This narrative strategy establishes a gradually zooming-in progress of a focal point so that the readers following the progress, prepare themselves and anticipate for the appearance of the divine throne as the highlight of the report. This gradual process can be explained in terms of the level of proximity to the deity, as well. The double use of עָמַד in vv. 24-25 indicates that the approaching movement has finished, and the chariot is now stationed close by to Ezekiel, enabling him to hear the thunderous sound in v. 25 and to observe the shape on the chariot more closely.

The intensity of the approach is also heightened by the presence of an auditory effect from v. 24 onwards, first the sound of the wings of the creatures, then the sound of something else above the firmament, associated with the deity itself in v. 25. These audial elements are not verbal, but, like the sounds in Exod. 19, indicate the growing proximity of the deity (note the increase in volume and intensity from Exod. 19:16 to 19:19).

2) Ezekiel 8-11: Jerusalem Temple

This first temple vision remarks with this question: "Have you seen Ben Adam (8:12, 15, 17)," which indicates that the initial focalizer is YHWH or his Spirit which is different from the primary focalizer (Ben Adam as first person narrator), through whose eyes everything is experienced and presented. Sweeney's interpretation on the sun-worshippers in Ezekiel 8 is a good example to show the ethics of readers based on the analysis of the focalization. Sweeney argues that the episode of the sun-worshippers in Ezekiel 8 has no room for other interpretation but the idolatry. However, he brings in the case of Habakkuk 3 which the God of Israel comes from the east and renews the temple and universe altogether.[165] Although Sweeney did not use the term focalization and the ethics of narrator, character, and reader, the basic concept has relevance to it. This shows how the observation of focalization helps our understanding of the text's intention and the reader's perception.

As Edgar Conrad points out, we readers see what Ezekiel sees, and we know that what Ezekiel sees is what YHWH sees. In other words, the narrator-character Ben Adam's focalization is strictly limited to the character YHWH's focalization. In chapters 8-11, he sees the destroyers of the city and the temple; in 40-48 he sees the restoration of the temple and the city.

2.3 Intertextual Readings and Writings

Emphasizing the uncertainty of authorial intention of the original text, recent biblical scholarship has presented all three aspects of intertextual reading: readerial, textual, and authorial.[166] Two categories, the readerly oriented intertextual reading and the authorial

---

[165] Sweeney, *Reading Ezekiel*, 56-57.

[166] Sweeney, *Form and Intertextuality*, Introduction, 1-9; idem, "Isaiah 60-62 in Intertextual Perspective" (Presented in SBL National Meeting in San Diego, National Association of Professors of Hebrew, Nov. 2014).

intertextual reading, are particularly important. In this discussion, intertextuality in reading the

text is a crucial starting point since it shows the essence of the biblical texts and human nature.

Comparative methodology in any reading and writing is intrinsic, because we come to

understand the text by comparison and in particular, the Bible is the very product of

intertextuality. This section explores the various methodologies in terms of reading process or

doing exegesis of the text. With the framework of intertextuality, I will unpack the process of

reading the text in terms of intertextual engagement, from one's initiative reading to the

rereading of her first reading. My reading strategy encourages practicing all four stages of

reading: 1) initiative readerial intertextual reading; 2) text-oriented reading for the textual

investigations; 3) authorial intertextuality; and 4) heuristic reflections on one's reading.

Before jumping to each stage, let me define and clarify the terms for this methodology

first. Reader of the Bible (RB) refers to any reader who reads the text within the framework of

the Bible as a book in any version, including hypertext on the computer. As the definition defines,

the term RB should be applied to the post-canonized period readers who have almost unlimited

intertextual reading materials to access. This freedom ironically has often misled the casual RB

to ignore the compositional history, the layers of the editions.

The next two terms are somewhat transformative with each other since the "Reader of the

Earlier Text" (RET) often becomes the "Author of the Later Text" (ALT). In other words, the

desire of the writing of this author comes from him reading an earlier text in front of him.

"Middle Authors" (MA) mainly refers to editors in the case of the Bible formation. These

authors are not the author strictly speaking, since they did not make an independent text through

composition but left the traces by leaving their portions of revision on the existing text. The text

which has a long history of oral traditions and compositional history would have thick layers of

78

the Middle Author group. All of these authors wear the modified adjective "implied": implied Author, implied Middle Authors, implied Original Reader Group, implied Reader of the Bible, etc. This modification is unavoidable since the belief in the possibility to grasp the stable "blood-flesh" actual reader and author is a myth, even in this mass-media society.

Let us begin with the RET, the author as the Reader of the Earlier Text. This reader-author produces his original text from several materials and motives. For him, there might be the available earlier texts in a visible form, eyewitnesses, or his own memories. At the same time, he has his own desire to compose a new text, either as a necessary response or from an appeal to his community. Our text Ezekiel 8-11 is a best fitted example as the product of this ALT (Author of the Later Text), and so dynamic intertextual reading is crucial for understanding the text.

2.3.1 Intertextual Reading Strategies

Let us start from the general questions on intertextual reading. Why do we readers want or feel the need to do intertextual reading? Does the inquiry come from our desire? Or does it come from the sincere reading of the text, i.e., does the text send us signs?[167] What if the author did not practice intertextual writing in her works at all? How about the case in which the author laid intertextual layers in a very subtle way?

In fact, for both Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes, who were the initial runners of this field, the text is "a mosaic of quotations without quotation marks."[168] Thus, all texts are

---

[167] Kirsten Nielsen emphasizes the calling of the marker of the text, arguing the double character of this marker as the problem giver and the solution giver. Only with the intertextual entertainment revealed to the readers, they can get the answer according to his account. Kirsten Nielsen, "Intertextuality and Hebrew Bible," in *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998*, vol. 80, ed. A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø, VTSup (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 19.

[168] Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 15; Roland Barthes, *The Rustle*

essentially conceived of as inter-texts. As Thomas Hatina summarizes, "intertextuality refers to the relationship between written texts, primarily as the imbedding of fragments of earlier texts within later texts."[169] This definition is very descriptive and looks convenient to the modern readers for whom the chronological order of compositional dates between the two texts are easily known by bibliographical information. Nonetheless, it turns into a very complicated task when the interpreters should deal with ancient literature like the Bible.

Even if we do know the authors of the two texts and their histories of the compositional growths, still the authorial intention matter remains vague. Because of this ambiguity, this reading strategy in Hebrew Bible[170] is often overlapped with the traditio-historical criticism practices at least in two points. First, traditio-historical critics also deal with the text as the starting point of reconstructing the tradition behind the final form of the text. Often, the author is replaced by the expression of the reading community or receiving community of the earlier traditions. Intertextual reading of the two texts, if we do not know the relationship between two authors, should also be satisfied with focusing on the texts, not the authors. Second, just as the authorial intertextual reading seeks the directions and rationales behind the similar/different

---

of Language, trans. Richard Howard (University of California Press: 1989), 60. A direct quotation comes from Barthes'.

[169] Thomas Hatina*, In Searching of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2002), 5.

[170] For the detailed discussions among biblical scholars, see Knut. M. Heim, "The Perfect King of Psalm 72: An Intertextual Enquiry," in *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic texts*, ed. P. E. Satterthwaite, R. S. Hess, and G.J. Wenham (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995), 233-48; Danna Nolan Fewell, ed., *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992). For the discussion of innerbiblical connections of intertextual reading, see Anja Klein, "Prophecy Continued: Reflections on Innerbibical Exegesis in the Book of Ezekiel," *VT* 60 (2010): 571-82.

phenomena of the two texts, so the goal of the traditio-historical criticism seeks the whole picture

of the compositional growth history from the earliest to the present form if possible.[171]

Nonetheless, David Carr challenges the assumed unified reading, saying "this claim is

only an illusion made by the reader and his or her interpretive community who attempts to

impose a unified reading on a given text."[172] Furthermore, he sharply points out that those

readers would claim that their assertion of the unity comes from the text itself, not from their

subjective impositions. With this logic, Carr indeed discourages any effort to set up authorial

intertextuality since fractures of the text are not the remarks of the later text but the phenomena

of the diverse readings, even when the text does not have any redactional history.[173]

Meanwhile, in his SBL presentation on Prophetic Literature,[174] Sweeney proposes a

different direction. First, he points out the limitation or difficulty of the author-centered

criticisms including redactional and inner-biblical criticisms. Then connecting reader-response

criticism with the trend of synchronic approach, he points out that interpreters claim images they

have made from their own concerns as the textual images which the author intentionally planted.

Up to that point, Carr and Sweeney share the similar perspective regarding the inaccessibility to

the author's intentional world. Sweeney, however, acknowledges the reader's active role as the

giver of the meaningful light on the text as well as the author's fundamental role as the creator of

the meaning on the text.

---

[171] Douglas A. Knight, "Traditio-Historical Criticism: The Development of the Covenant Code," in *Method Matters: Essays on the Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David L. Petersen*, ed. Joel M. LeMon and Kent Harold Richards (Atlanta: SBL, 2009), 98

[172] David M. Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

[173] David M. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 23.

[174] Sweeney, "Isaiah 60-62 in Intertextual Perspective."

As Sweeney shows, interpreters should admit that the actual entertainment of any analysis on the text is proposed by an individual user's own desire, pre-knowledge, and possible sources. In other words, intertextual reading is practically a readerial activity,[175] especially for the ancient text, since it is more difficult to consult authorial and textual (character's) intertextual reading due to its uncertain compositional date. For this reason, Antje Laban, as Sweeney does in his form critical analysis, encourages the synchronic reading as the starting point over any other diachronic concerns including historical contexts. Thus, understanding of a metaphor occurs between "the text" and "its reader" as the product of the reader's "reality" and "response" based on it.[176] This open discussion on the reader's role in intertextuality invites interpreters to a more flexible world.[177]

In this situation, what features should my "flexible" foundations have in intertextual reading? How can I control my desire as the reader to claim that I can draw a relatively comprehensive picture of the author's world? On one hand, I, the interpreter, should give warning of uncertainty to my desire which would like to assert the certain scenario of the intertextuality. At the same time, I should also give some degree of confidence to my depressed

---

[175] Following advocates give almost unlimited power to the readers and their communities. But, I still believe the scope of the interpretations even though each community shows its own interpretation to the world of criticism for the assessment of their readings. Iser, *The Act of Reading*; Umberto Eco, *The Role of Reader: Explorations on the Semiotics of Texts* (London: Hutchinson, 1981); Stanly Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge, MS: Harvard Univ. Press, 1980).

[176] Antje Laban, "Metaphor and Intertextuality: 'Daughter of Zion' as a Test Case," *SJOT* 17 (2003): 50.

[177] Carleen Mandolfo also compares the two differing understandings of genre, a classical form critic Gunkel and Russian formalist Bakhtin. Mandolfo summarizes that for Gunkel genres get impurity when it meets intertetxts while for Bakhtin genres are waiting for their users to be transformed. The two different attitudes show the history of acknowledging reader's role in reading. Carleen Mandolfo, "Dialogic Form criticism: An Intertextual Reading of Lamentations and Psalms of Lament," in *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies*, ed. Roland Boer (Atlanta: SBL, 2007), 69.

desire which attempts to attribute everything to just "my" interpretation. This latter desire needs to be controlled, too, since this apparent humble mind indeed has a potential seed of explosion to advocate that thus everything is possible in the realm of reader's response. One may hesitate to maintain "authorial" intertextual activity in this reader dominated reality because "author" seems to have disappeared a long time ago.

At this point, Kirsten Nielsen's proposal is noteworthy.[178] In order to fully appreciate intertextual reading, Nielsen argues, we need three separate phases in intertextual reading. In phase one, interpreters pay attention to catch the indispensable signifiers which call for the reader's attention, while in phase two readers observe any seam of the text as a result of the editorial work in the formation of the Hebrew Bible. Meanwhile, the third phase, in which readers actively create room, is more related to the dialogues of reception history or reader's response criticism. In her argument, Nielsen introduces Gary Philips' coinage "intergesis" as "the act of rewriting or inserting texts within some more or less established network where meaning does not lie 'inside' texts but rather in the space 'between' texts."[179]

What shall we consider, if, as Nielsen and Philips propose, we can hardly find the meaning of the text inside the single text, but we can find it "in the space 'between' texts"?[180] We seriously need all three kinds of intertextual reading strategy—authorial, textual, and readerial—since all three agents have power, desire, and contexts; at the same time none of the three strategies can enjoy the freedom to escape from the other two. All three strategies are bound together, sometimes explicitly and sometimes in a subtle way.

---

[178] Nielsen, "Intertextuality and Hebrew Bible," 17-32.

[179] George Aichele and Gary A. Philips, "Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis," Intertextuality and the Bible, *Semeia* 69/70 (1995): 14.

[180] Nielsen, "Intertextuality and Hebrew Bible," 19.

2.3.2 Application of Intertextual Reading Strategy: Illustration

Here is the illustration of my reading. First I admit that when I read the text before me, I the interpreter have both constructive and destructive desires and have been wandering between the two incompatible desires. Then, I make a distinction by labeling the former as "contextualized author-oriented intertextuality" and the latter as "textualized reader-oriented intertextuality." Although other kinds of intertextual readings are not excluded, I propose the two kinds of intertextual reading would be the most recommendable by the "check and balance" principle between text, reader, and author.

"Contextualized" in "contextualized author-oriented intertextuality" gives the emphatic connotation that the interpreter's presentation of supposed intertextual activities of the author. These activities which are reflected on the text are indeed contextualized by the reader who has observed all available and desirable sources. On the other hand, "textualized" in "textualized reader-oriented intertextuality" rather gives some check-point based on the textual evidence in consulting the reader's imaginative intertextual activities.

This concept can be explained with the analogy of the relationship between God, the text, and the believer. The believer has conviction that she has a complete or at least comprehensive picture of God because her picture is made from the text that she believes very trustful. Thus, when she encounters a different presentation of the image of God from a different believer, she will be first shocked and then observe how much that newly presented image is based on the same text and on the same interpretations. Both presenters will negotiate with each other again based on the "text," though the reality is that they begin to negotiate their interpretations/imaginations. To what degree can they accept some images as "image of God"? Indeed, it all depends on each individual's contexts, and the scope of the text to embrace by the negotiators.

84

Finally, I would like to propose to use the term "users" in this intertextual entertainment. The term "users" here refers to all possible agents of the text including flesh-and-blood authors, editors, compilers, transmitters, scribes, implied authors, narrators, characters, literary audiences, implied audiences, and later groups of the audiences and readers throughout the ages. As Claudia Bergann asserts, the possibility of recognizing a larger scope from the text depends on modern readers' awareness of all the previous users of the text. [181]

Allan Pasco discusses about the case of the failure of allusion to draw reader's attention. He explains the subtlety of allusion indeed is related to its aim to suggest something else. Thus, it must be recognized before it can influence the story but not in a full form.[182]

In defining various terms regarding intertextual reading of the biblical text, Benjamin Sommer does a slightly different approach.[183] Sommer defines "allusion" and "influence" as the diachronic approach which shows the compositional growth of the text up to the present form, therefore much on the author oriented terms. On the contrary, "Intertextuality" for Sommer more focuses on the synchronic approach and the reader oriented terms.[184] If we follow these terms, authorial intertextual reading would be correspondent with Sommer's allusion and influence and the readerial reading with the intertextuality. Text oriented intertextual reading would cover both. And in answering the practical questions of intertextual reading between the two texts in their

---

[181] Claudia D. Bergmann, *Childbirth as a Metaphor for Crisis: Evidence from the Ancient Near East, the Hebrew Bible, and 1QH XI, 1-18*, BZAW 382 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 6-8.

[182] Allan H. Pasco, *Allusion: A Literary Graft*, Emf Reprints (Toronto: Rookwood Press, 2002), 9.

[183] Benjamin D. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998).

[184] Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 6-8.

formal levels, Sommer proposes three essential criteria: "explicit citation, implicit reference, and inclusion."[185]

As Sommer points out,[186] the difficulty of the intertextual reading of the Bible lies in the illusive historical settings of the two texts, and thus we should admit that it is hard to confidently say the directions between the two texts, alluding and being alluded.

For our practical application in intertextual reading, it is worthy now to introduce Ben-Porat Ziva's four stages of allusion application in reading the two texts: 1) recognition of the "markers" in the referring text and of "the marked" in the evoked text; 2) the identification of the evoked text; 3) reader's adjustment of the sign- interpretation from the alluding text; and 4) reader's activation of the entire alluded text to connect to the alluding text.[187]

2.4 Spatial Theory

2.4.1 Space Related Theories

What is "space"? Jon Berquist states that space has its own genealogy and history. "Space is something we make, create, form, inform, deform, and reform."[188] Approaching the post-modern era, there has been some crucial transition regarding the concept of space: from the notion of scale in space to the Einsteinian notion in which the speed and sense of the space are not measured from the absolute standard, but are relevant to the observer. According to this new notion, there is no fixed framework of perception of space. This new concept, roughly starting

---

[185] Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 20.

[186] Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 10-12.

[187] Ben-Porat Ziva, "The Poetics of Literary Allusion," *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1 (1976): 105-28.

[188] Jon L. Berquist, "Critical Spatiality and the Construction of the Ancient World," in *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social, and Historical Constructs in Honor or James W. Flanagan*, ed. David M. Gunn and P. M. McNutt, JSOTSup 359 (Sheffiled: Sheffiled Academic, 2002). 14-15.

from Michel Foucault's *Heterotopia* in the 1960s, challenges two previous assumptions: 1) the existence of the scale in space and 2) everything in the scale can be measured and be harmonious.[189] Instead of those assumptions, postmodern scholars bring the complex system and chaos theory with the fractal notion to see the various aspects and unexpected phenomena from the spatial observation.[190] With the help of this postmodern scholarship, we can now understand more clearly and abundantly the spatial dimensions of the text, especially in terms of social and historical contexts. That constructed space, according to Berquist, was also produced from various contested environments.[191]

The presupposition of its application to the biblical interpretation lies in the conviction that every spatial datum, which critical spatiality catches, has been reflected (even in a distorted manner) in its social production. Ancient document like Hebrew Bible is no exception.[192] Study of critical spatiality can make interpreters more aware of the spatial dimensions of the narratives, interacting with other approaches. The present section will examine several leading scholars of this field and attempt to interpret the presentations on the fall of Jerusalem in Ezekiel 8-11 as well as in the book of Ezekiel. The review of the research on spatial aspects of the book of Ezekiel tells that the Ezekiel scholarship has produced many fruitful works on the study of the

---

[189] Michel Foucault, *Heterotopia.* Differences between Foucault's "heterotopia" and "dystopia" in this current study may lie in its reality and unreality. The former might refer to the counter-place to utopia in terms of its existence in the real world, while the latter is also a counter-notion to "utopia" in terms of its worse presentation of the real world.

[190] For example, David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 218; idem, *Spaces of Hope* (Berkeley: UC Press, 2000), 183-85.

[191] Berquist, *Constructions of Space I.*

[192] Cf. David M. Gunn and P. M. McNutt, eds. *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social, and Historical Constructs in Honor or James W. Flanagan*, JSOTSup 359 (Sheffiled: Sheffiled Academic, 2002).

final temple vision in chs. 40-48.[193] However, spatial study with the city focus in the book of Ezekiel is very rare.[194]

Mary Mills' study is exceptional in this venue, but does not touch the spaces in Ezekiel 8-11. That area is still waiting for the investigation. In her city study of the prophetic literature, Mills uses urban psycho-geography with the lens of "dreaming" in order to illustrate city dwellers' emotional experiences of the city in the critical times of ancient Israel.[195] She explains the importance of the temple in terms of the city and its dwellers' fates by providing a link between urban space and cosmic space, the depictions of violence and the destruction of the city, and the prevalence of the imagery of fertility and abundance functioning as a critique of urban society.[196] Mills analyzes the two main cities in the book of Ezekiel, Jerusalem and YHWH Shammah. In my present study, Mill's analysis of Ezekiel as flaneur, who maps the reality of the city as well as imagines the future city, gives some insight. This flaneur type can be analogous to many peripatetic philosophers in ancient China as well as in modern times. As we shall discuss

---

[193] For example, Kalinda Rose Stevenson, *Vision of Transformation: The Territorial Rhetoric of Ezekiel 40-48,* SBLDS 154 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996).

[194] For city Jerusalem study in other biblical literature with this spatial theory, see Jon L. Berquist, "Spaces of Jerusalem" in *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*, ed. John L. Berquist and Claudia V. Camp (New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 40-47; Maria Häusl, "Jerusalem, the Holy City: The Meaning of the City of Jerusalem in the Books of Ezra-Nehemiah," in *Constructions of Space V: Place, Space and Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, ed. Gert T. M. Prinsloo and Christl M. Maier (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 87-106; Christl M. Maier, "Whose Mother? Whose Space? Jerusalem in Third Isaiah," in *Constructions of Space V: Place, Space and Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, ed. Gert T. M. Prinsloo and Christl M. Maier (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 107-24. For a discussion of the centrality of Jerusalem, see also Ingrid Hjelm, *Jerusalem's Rise of Sovereignty: Zion and Gerizim in Competition*, JSOTSup 359 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2004); Melody D. Knowles, *Centrality Practiced: Jerusalem in the Religious Practice of Yehud and the Diaspora during the Persian Period*, SBLABS 16 (Atlanta: SBL, 2006).

[195] Mary E. Mills, *Urban Imagination in Biblical Prophecy* (New York: T&T Clark International, 2012), 11-13.

[196] Mills, *Urban Imagination in Biblical Prophecy*, 216-38.

further, another, more interesting finding is that this Ezekiel's identity as flaneur resembles Edward Soja's Thirdspace of the real and imagined life in a personified manner. This analysis builds the ground for the allusion of Ezekiel as a human embodiment of Thirding in the liminal time and space as the narrative situation of the book shows the life in the exilic period. Moreover, this imagination goes further to picture Ezekiel as the moving sanctuary, as his deity may dwell within him, which I will unpack in Part III. Mills' psycho-geography and Ezekiel as a flaneur will be discussed with the emphasis on Ezekiel's double identity as observer and participant.

2.4.1.1 Yi-Fu Tuan, Space and Place; Attachment to Homeland

Essential questions for Tuan are what is place and what gives place unique identity. To examine these questions, he first distinguishes between human experience and material environment. By doing so, Tuan expands the concept of geography from the physical field to metaphysical, ethical, and aesthetic fields.[197] Human beings, for him, interact with the environment in which they live. Therefore, his study is also a question of the meaning of living as human beings in the world. Followings are several important concepts to understand his space and place.

First, Tuan distinguishes space from place. If space shows freedom, openness, and is thus threatening, place is something which is enclosed, stable, and safe. While every move creates space, every moment in pause or stillness can cause the space to become a familiar place. Abstract space becomes concrete place through the process of meaning making.[198]

Second, Tuan points out to the importance of architectural space and its visual awareness. Sight among many other senses is the primary sense, so visual art like sculptures can teach

---

[197] Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*, 6th printing (Minneapolis: Minneapolis University Press, 2008).

[198] Tuan, *Space and Place,* 4-12.

people how to behave.[199] According to this principle, if somebody does not show himself but just informs his presence—in the case of God's voice in many biblical accounts, he easily becomes a more mysterious figure to the listener with fear. Nebuchadnezzar's colossus in the book of Daniel or Stonehenge in the ancient time, or even Gateway Arch of St. Louis in the USA play essentially the same function. So Tuan argues that raising an edifice can be the act of worship in its religious contexts, as we see in the medieval vertical buildings which were built toward the heaven.[200] This concept can explain the reason that the final vision of the book of Ezekiel is mostly concerned with the building project, either for the physical structure or the religious structure. By the same token, it should not be surprising, how YHWH must be angry with the jealous image in the Jerusalem temple in Ezek. 8:3-5 since that erecting activity is the very visible proclamation of changing the owner of the sacred place. Despite the earlier presentation of the strong rationale regarding the destruction of the city and the defilement of the temple, the divine abandonment still gives a shock to Ezekiel's audience that the foundation of their living is now annihilated. However, the two vision reports clearly boast that Israel's deity is not dead but is doing something really new thing even during their exile.

The present study will go one-step further. If the built environment and the destructed scenery have strong impressions to the community members, how shall the depiction of the moving scene of YHWH's sanctuary give the decisive impression to the readers, although all happened in the literary mind? This question from the observation on the spatial dimension of Ezekiel 8-11 is the basic driving force of this present study as I introduced in Chapter 1.

Third, pointing out the significance of the direction, Tuan explains that we human beings—especially traditional right- hand- user-society—have some biased notion of direction.

---

[199] Tuan, *Space and Place*, 15-16.

[200] Tuan, *Space and Place*, 101-05.

Among four directions and contrastive up and down, front and back, Tuan says people prefer upright, front, right as positive expressions and hopeful future expressions. Symmetrical structure of the city of God versus asymmetrical structure of the profaned city of man is also one example of the reflection of the direction on our notion of the space. In addition, centrality is also considered: people believed that they live in the center of the world both by location and height.[201] As Jerusalem is believed to be the highest point (conceptually) in the land of Israel, the new temple in the Ezekiel's vision is located on the very high mountain in Israel (40:2). Another example would be the last abominable scene of the twenty-five men at the east gate of the temple in Ezekiel 11. When this apparently repetitive scene of Ezek. 8:16 is combined with the departure of the glory of YHWH through the east gate, the reversal effect becomes very increased. For the ancient Israelites, and probably for most people, too, the east is something new, as though the world is renewed every day when the sun rises in the east. This preference will turn out to be the extreme abhorrence in the case of Ezekiel 8-11 when YHWH is replaced by the sun deity in his own place. But, as we expect, the book of Ezekiel is well aware of this matter of the direction that it shows the glory of YHWH comes back through the very east gate later in the final temple vision.

Fourth, drawing maps is the evidence of the power to conceptualization. Map requests might come from the necessity to hand down precious information to somebody.[202] Ezekiel as the maker of a miniature Jerusalem in Ezekiel 4 is an example of the author's strong desire to control/manipulate/educate his audience. Tuan also illustrates that mapping is God's view to transform something to eternal.[203] With this perspective, several maps, diagrams, and directions

---

[201] Tuan, *Space and Place*, 35-37, 91-94.

[202] Tuan, *Space and Place*, 90-100.

[203] Tuan, *Space and Place*, 123.

in Ezekiel 40-48 present the importance of space division as well as the human use of space in the coming new world. Contrastive to the new temple vision tour, the tour in Ezekiel 8 appears not so orderly arranged. Indeed, the order of the temple tour in Ezekiel 8-11 is designated only by opening the secret door according to the gradation of the holiness. As I will show in detail in the text analysis, the difficulty in experiencing the conceptual mapping of the Jerusalem temple in Ezekiel 8-11 may be an intended effect of the implied allusion of disorder. In other words, the text suggests that the Jerusalem temple has been already in the process of its chaotic status.

Fifth, regarding time and space/place relationship, Tuan argues that human beings' feelings in specific places are in fact dependent upon time. In other words, place makes time visible. Movement in space makes us travel either backward to the past or forward to the future.[204] Tuan's this concept gives a new insight to understanding of the past and future obsession of the book of Ezekiel. It is because the most important and the only meaningful place for Ezekiel and his community is Jerusalem which is not available in the present time; the present becomes the mere container to hold the past memory and the future agenda. I will deal with this matter along with Nostalgia, Dystopia, and Heterotopia topics in Part III.

Another example of the time and place relationship in the book of Ezekiel can be found in the temporal remark on the final vision. The final vision was given on the tenth day of the month, in the fourteenth year of exile (Ezek. 40:1), which makes it possible to interpret the dating, as Sweeney argues, to either the New Year or Yom Kippur depending on the chosen calendar system.[205] Both dates are very significant in the biblical tradition. If we interpret the date as New Year, the character Ezekiel and his community now keep their own ethnic New Year festival, not the one which the surrounding environment forces them to be assimilated into

---

[204] Tuan, *Space and Place,* 118-32.

[205] Sweeney, *Reading Ezekiel*, 195-96.

92

Akitu Festival at the New Year. If the vision happens at Yom Kippur, the exiled priest Ezekiel finally could enter the holy of holies on the very day dedicated to the entrance to the sanctuary. Meanwhile, the temple in the final vision (Ezekiel 40-48) is "rested" in the timeless future. Nobody knows when it will be realized; it is only expressed as "on that day." This timelessness can be interpreted in two contrastive ways: first, it enhances this vision more to the ideal or even utopian dream; at the same time, however, this timeless with the unlimited possibilities in terms of its fulfillment makes all the text-involved agents—its authors, characters, and readers— experience the temporal violence from its indeterminacy.

The sixth concept, "exile," is important for our discussion, too. For Tuan, in the formation of the nation, people build the temple and villages. Building the temple is often associated with the local gods making his or her sacred dwelling place in the midst of the people. Thus, withdrawal/expulsion from the place is simply entering to chaos.[206] Enemies raze the people and destroy the temple and monuments not only from their random anger; destroying temples is also the action of disposing local gods. Tuan argues that the worst fate usually falls onto exile. Ruin of the city means ruin of cosmos for the ancients and the loss of the reason to live by.[207] When we can recognize and appreciate the significance of the spatial meanings by which the ancient authors and their audience must have communicated, the intensions of the text will be more fully delivered.

Tuan's study on the spatial dimensions of building and destroying does not end here. At this abject moment of exile and the loss of hometown, Tuan introduces insightful ideas. Human

---

[206] Tuan, *Space and Place*, 154-60. Recently the life of not to build the temple is highlighted by Eva Mroczek as the life of enduring to wait the indeterminate time. Eva Mroczek, "How Not to Build a Temple: Jacob, David, and the Unbuilt Ideal in Ancient Judaism," *JSJ* 46 (2015): 1-35.

[207] Tuan, *Space and Place*, 153-56.

beings have a strong recuperative power, so they adjust their frustration and make a new yearning toward making/creating a center in the mind.[208] The word "in the mind" is attractive enough to make us imagine and examine the possible parallels in the book of Ezekiel. Thus, new space in the new setting in the new society is absolutely possible in the abandoned situation we see in the book of Ezekiel.

This desire can be explained in Tuan's term "Attachment to homeland."[209] Tuan explains that being rootless as a result of being homeless makes people long to return to their original or old home land. This feeling is universal. In the unstable spaces, people try to recapture the past in some sense on one hand, but on the other hand, they also attempt to efface or "correct" the past. The book of Ezekiel shows both reactions in various forms. First, Ezekiel 4-5 clearly shows the cut-off from the past through Ezekiel making the miniature of the old city Jerusalem, performing its siege, and proclaiming that it is the end. Now, informed readers from Ezekiel 4—or the *golah* community—gets the confirmation that they are not thrown into the isolated and estranged foreign land, but indeed saved into the place where YHWH their deity would stay with them during their exilic time. Then, Ezekiel also performs via text, at least, the new world and new era to come. Chapters 44-46, among many examples, reflect this concern. For example, compared to the Levitical laws in Torah, and the king and Levites' status in the Solomonic temple era, Ezekiel's society shows a very different picture in that the Zadokites have a power control. Thus, it is an attachment to homeland that has been greatly adjusted by the planner/dreamer, Ezekiel, a presumed Zadokite priest.

---

[208] Tuan, *Space and Place*, 170-74.

[209] Tuan, *Space and Place*, 149-60.

Tuan's contribution to consider both time and space together will be very useful for us as an interpreting method to understand somewhat incomprehensible presentations of the book of Ezekiel and to see the book as a painful but sensational product in the exilic era.

2.4.1.2 Henri Lefebvre, The Production of Space; Writings on Cities

As a Marxist philosopher, Lefebvre started questioning the traditionally understood absolute characteristics of space. Criticizing the previous generations' notion of Euclidean geometry and the Kantian notion of space as the absolute empty container, Lefebvre asserted that space is a social production.[210] By emphasizing this historicity of the space, he corrected the imbalance of time over space and seriously pondered the historicity of space.[211] Unlike the Hegelian philosopher, however, Lefebvre balanced material things and mental things together in explanation of the triad spatiality since he convicted that space a production of a social formation (mode of production) as well as a mental construction (conception).[212] Eventually, Lefebvre summarized the tripartite aspects of space as such: spatial practice (material/physical/perceived); representations of the space (ideal/mental/conceived); and spaces of representation (material-imagined/social/lived).[213]

Among many unique ideas, his critique on the capitalist city is noteworthy. Recognizing the class struggle in one's life was "inscribed" even in the space the people used, Lefebvre criticized that the city in the capital society is the imagined utopia as monument to the power

---

[210] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space,* trans. D. Nicholson-Smith (Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1991).

[211] James W. Flanagan, "Ancient Perception of Space/Perceptions of Ancient Space," *Semeia* 87 (1999): 15-43.

[212] Stuart Elden, *Understanding Henri Lefebvre: Theory and the Possible* (London, New York: Continuum, 2004), 185.

[213] Lefebvre, *The Production of Space,* 1-5.

structures that invisibilized violence and inequity.[214] In respect to the ideology of space, capitalists use the knowledge to hide the ideology of the space. Even though the capitalists or other power-holders attempt to masquerade and show its false neutrality and objectivity, the lived space can open the possibility of breaking this huge dominance. Thus, for Lefebvre, space theory is not merely a treatise but the active force and proclamation of the new world.

This capital city and power-related idea will be important for our discussion in several ways. First, even though I am aware of the gap between the era of Lefebvre and the Babylonian exilic era, we can apply this capitalistic power to the power of Babylonian empire and see Babylon, the capital city, as the invisible control tower over its captives. As we shall see, this might be one of the possible reasons to explain the silence about Babylon in the book of Ezekiel. Second, we can also apply this "capital city" notion to the utopian restoration city in the Promised Land as we see the reflection in Ezekiel 40-48. The positive hope and the reason of survival in the captive life at the same time can function as a good strategy to endure the apparently endless time waiting for the return. The third implication will be unpacked with Soja's Thirdspace, which has the potential transcendent power to reconfigure the balance of the popular physical perception of the space and officially conceived space.[215] Overall, this "Thirding" gives the marginalized the possibility to create counter projects at odds with the dominant powerful project. More concretely, it is plausible to say that Ezekiel's resistance against the colonial power of the Babylonian empire as well as his fight against the remaining community in Jerusalem is to build up the Thirdspace in his wilderness-like exilic land in a very unique way.

[214] Henri Lefebvre, *Writings on Cities*, trans. Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas (Maleden, MA: Blackwell, 1996), 147-50; 180.

[215] Edward Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989), 43-75.

2.4.1.3 Edward Soja, Postmodern Geographies

According to Christl Maier, "Soja understands Lefebvre's tripartite epistemology of space as ontology of space."[216] Soja starts with the notion that "space is epistemologically triune."[217] Naming First-Second-Third on the triad notion of Lefebvre, Soja contextualizes his notion to an American context and transforms Lefebvre's theoretical logical moves to the effect of the modes of production and more strongly emphasizes the transformative dynamics.[218] For Soja, Firstspace is geophysical realities as perceived. It is concrete materiality of spatial forms, so one can empirically map it. Secondspace is an attentive re-representation of human spatiality and the mapped reality as represented. Thirdspace is the lived realities and is understood as comprehensive and transformative of the First and Second spaces. It is dominated space.[219] McNutt summarizes Soja's Thirdspace as lived space which embodies the real- and imagined-life world of expressions. It is the transgression of the second-spaced intention.[220] Berquist also points out that Thirdspace partially encapsulates the notion of "lived realities" in the notion of practiced and imaginative elements in it.[221] Important warnings from both Lefebvre and Soja are that all first, second, and third spaces are not separate and independent spaces but one space as three aspects of a singular space.

---

[216] Christl Maier, *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion: Gender, Space, and the Sacred in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 13.

[217] Claudia Camp, "Storied Space, or, Ben Sira 'Tells' a Temple," in *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds,* 65.

[218] Edward Soja, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1996).

[219] Soja, *Postmodern Geographies,* 43-52.

[220] McNutt, "'Fathers of the Empty Spaces' and 'Strangers Forever'," 30-50.

[221] Berquist, "Critical Spatiality and the Construction of the Ancient World," 10-15.

Through the lens of Soja's viewpoint, Mills proposes a two-fold presentation of the book of Ezekiel. Mills' observation makes sense when we understand the overwhelming transformative presentation in the book of Ezekiel as the radical change from a first phase (Firstspace), as the indescribable catastrophe to a second phase (Secondspace), as the unbelievable and unexpected realm of rebuilding both city and community in a new era (Thirdspace).[222] I believe this triad spatiality is very dramatically practiced in the book of Ezekiel, and even in Ezekiel 8-11 with the deep theological concerns. Notions of nostalgia, dystopia and heterotopia would make understandings that are more effective on the critical spatial dimensions of the text.

How can this critical spatial theory help us understand the biblical spaces through the text? Christl Maier's conviction will be helpful:

> I hold that any space described in biblical texts is not only classifiable as conceived space produced by metaphor and ideology, but that it comprises all three dimensions of space: its materiality/topography, ideology, and the experience of living in it. Thus, I propose that the experience of people living in Jerusalem, their ideas about its sacredness as well as their attempt to make this sacredness visible through buildings and rituals, is accessible through the ancient texts that are handed down to the present day.[223]

Henri Lefebvre and Edward Soja's sociological methods thus will be used to see how the mapping, writing, speaking, and visioning *within* the authoritative text may function to claim the ownership in the given space.

---

[222] Mills, *Urban Imagination in the Prophecy,* 7.

[223] Christl Maier, *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion*, 14.

2.4.1.3 Heterotopia and Its Applications to the Text

The term "Heterotopia" first appeared in Foucault's work on Borges,[224] and has

produced various nuances in the diverse fields.[225] As several scholars have argued, the seed of

this even paradoxical and confusing reception history might exist in Foucault's original idea

because Foucault's notion of heterotopia itself shows somewhat contradictory or incompatible

notions. For example, in the preface of *The Order of Things*, "heterotopia" is depicted an entirely

unimaginable space, possible only in language.[226] On the contrary, in "Of Other Spaces," the

same term is used as a real place despite its strong mythical sense.[227] Recently, Kevin Knight

thus emphasizes the unreal notion of heterotopia in comparison of the three modern/postmodern

exile fictions.[228] Given this situation, we need to think of the two apparently incompatible

notions together, as Foucault describes heterotopia, as a "simultaneously mythic and real

contestation of the space in which we live."[229]

---

[224] Michael Foucault, 'Préface' in *Les mots et les choses*, Paris: Éditions Gallimard (1966), 7-17. Its English translation appears as Foucault, 'Preface' in *The Order of Things* (Andover, Hants: Tavistock, 1970), xv-xxiv. Cf. Another version of English translation: Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage Books, 1973).

[225] For the overview in various fields, Peter Johnson's blog, "Heterotopian Studies," will provide the good information. http://www.heterotopiastudies.com/

[226] Foucault, *The Order of Things*, Preface, xx.

[227] Benjamin Genocchio, "Discourse, Discontinuity, Difference: The Question of 'Other' Spaces'," in *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*, ed. Sophie Watson and Katherine Gibson (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 37; Heidi Sohn, "Heterotopia: anamnesis of a medical term," in *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a Postcivil Society*, ed. Michiel Dehaene and Lieven de Cauter (London: Routledge, 2007), 44; Soja, *Thirdspace*, 159.

[228] Kevin Knight, "Real Places and Impossible Spaces: Foucault's Heterotopia in the Fiction of James Joyce, Vladimir Nabokov, and W.G. Sebald," Ph. D. thesis: University of East Anglia (2014). There, Knight challenges Soja's application of Foucaultian heterotopia to the real site as misleading of Borges. See especially, 25-27.

[229] Michel Foucault, "Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias," in *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*, ed. Neil Leach (NYC: Routledge, 1997), 24.

Accordingly, it would be wise to select several relevant aspects of Foucault's and other critics' heterotopia notions in reading our text Ezekiel 8-11. Followings are brief sketches of them for the preliminary introduction for Part III discussion later.

First, let us start from the departing place, Ben Adam's house. One of the exiles' living place for the next day labor is surprisingly used as a ritualistic inquiry by elders of Judah (8:1) and as a transition space where Ben Adam was lifted up by the Spirit (8:1-3). This house plays as a mirror in Foucault's term by framing the narrative (Ezekiel 8-11). Thus, this frame narrative's use of the mirror simultaneously points towards the re-formation of the self and the deconstruction of that re-formed self. This frame narrative also takes place in the heterotopia of the theatre and the stage. Foucault refers to the theatre as a heterotopic site in the sense that it brings other places to life. In my reading, the unnamed valley presumably in Babylonia is the most excellent example of heterotopia in the book of Ezekiel. The abandoned and abhorrently sacrilegious place becomes the very historic place of resurrection when the holy God of Israel visited that place. This is only possible in the vision which all surpasses the common sense rule of the priestly regulations. This is the reason that the dried bone vision in 37:1-14 is a fascinating story to many readers in various traditions. This coexistence of the dead and the living appear in the Foucault's fifth principle in which he shows the bourgeois' cemeteries in the middle of the churchyard and of the street.[230] In the vision of Ezekiel 11, the text shows the moment of the death happening in the chamber of the temple precinct.

Second, from this acknowledgment, I would like to pay attention to the literary structure of Ezekiel 8-11 as a shrewd, compositional strategy. I will make argument later in detail with the text-based analysis, but now here is the brief agenda of the heterotopic aspect of Ezekiel 8-11. As

---

[230] Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," 330-36.

the first literary device, the first temple vision employs a framing narrative and thus it produces a framed narrative. Furthermore, it also uses a very high degree of focalization by setting the departing point at Ben Adam's house. His house itself contains Edward Soja's Thirdspace function. From the perspective of the Babylonian city planners, it must be surprising that the place was transformed from the captive's inhabitant place for next day labors to the unexpected lived space of the revelation of the divine will. Third, vision as a genre constantly alerts that all things of recounting are not real although it is very realistically presented; at the same time, the divine revelation pushes both its audience and readers to believe the story as real. Lastly, it is really a shocking conversion that the place of nostalgia, Jerusalem, is depicted as dystopia and already destroyed in the vision. The implication of this transformation seems huge enough to encourage the audience of Ben Adam's vision to change their identity from the abandoned and cut-off people to the snatched from fire to reserving life.

Third principle of Foucault's heterotopia is the crisis heterotopias. There, the Jerusalem temple was regarded as a hidden and forbidden place where its accessibility is extremely limited up to the vision narrative started. This forbiddance or gradation of holiness was not revealed before but now in the vision narrative revealed as the most abominable place and must be defiled. The crisis heterotopia is revealed to the way of dystopia: I will deal with this one in Chapter 8 From Heterotopia to Heterotopia.

Fourth notion is about making Jerusalem and its temple a dystopia. By making a dystopia, the author cut off the not recommendable nostalgia. This is a regressive aspect of heterotopia. Since the term "heterotopia" is neutral in its connotations and practical applications, it can cover all the elements in the title of this study: imagining and visioning YHWH's throne is coming to

the exilic land; being preoccupied in the events in other place only with nostalgia; making hometown dystopia, etc.

According to Foucault, heterotopias are often related to interrupted and broken piece times, i.e., heterochronies, and the best occasion is the heterochrony of absolute breach from the traditional time. The cemetery makes the typical case of this. The heterotopic place begins with genesis of the surprising heterochrony, the complete cessation of the ordinary time of life, and continues its seclusion into the space of the eternal disappearance.[231]

Another example of heterotopia caused by heterochrony is libraries and museums, or the places of accumulating time, where time forever keeps building up on top of itself. From the 19th century to our modernity, these places begin to have ambition to absorb everything of all kinds of knowledge in all eras of all people to construct an invincible, isolated, immovable heterotopia beyond time and beyond demolition. In the 17th century, though with the same heterotopic qualities in regards to change of time, the places are yet of individuals and reflect individuals' tastes on the knowledge of the archives collected.[232]

Along the same line of thoughts, in the book of Ezekiel, reading the scroll and swallowing the scroll creates the heterotopia of his body as the safe place to keep it. Writing the book of Ezekiel is another way of making other space to hoard the past and the future isolated and protected, out of time and destruction. And these two heterotopias are conjured from the sudden incursion of the heterochrony of the exile, the appalling collapse of the traditional time.[233]

---

[231] Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," 26.

[232] Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," 30.

[233] Cf. Roland Barthes, *Writing Degree Zero*, trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith (London: Jonathan Cape, 1967), 32.

102

Finally, heterotopia's power of making linear time to heterochrony gives some clue to the question "why the book of Ezekiel is filled with the past and the future instead of the present encounters."

2.4.2 Collective Memory or Memory Making

Essential questions of Maurice Halbwachs are how people can keep the same group identity even though their environments and their homelands are significantly changed and they are far from the homeland. What brings and holds them together? Who remembers and how, if they hold some memories?[234]

As a student of Emil Durkheim, a social, cultural anthropologist who emphasizes the totem ritual as the important tool for the transmission of the tradition, Halbwachs coins the term "collective memory" to describe the stories, artifacts, food, and whatever else binds group members together.[235] His term "collective memory" is one of the three elements (autobiographical memory; collective memory; and historical memory) of the tradition or group identity making. Autobiographical memory is the personally experienced events and is not sufficient to make a group identity. It is too subjective and is not self-aware of social influence although individuals are affected from their society in shaping their autobiographical memory. On the other hand, historical memory, produced by the expert historians, pursues the objectively presented and detailed lists and thus very systemizes content in an abstract way. In contrast, collective memory exists outside of time and space and continues through the generations. Although it is not elaborate and detailed, and is constantly changed according to the current

---

[234] Cf. Claire Whitlinger, "From Countermemory to Collective Memory: Acknowledging the 'Mississippi Burning' Murders," *Sociological Forum* 30 (2015): 648-70.

[235] Emile Durkheim, "From The Elementary Forms of Religious Life," in *The Collective Memory Reader*, ed. Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 136-38.

society's needs—so sometimes even being self-contradictory—it can tie the particular group's identity with its inward characteristic.[236] This notion can be very useful to explain the unique contribution of redactor(s) on the final form of the text in Hebrew Bible, or to set up the different layers of socio-historical settings on the text. While Durkheim stays in the individual identity, Halbwachs expands the idea of totems to include commemorative events as reminders of critical memory.[237]

The purpose of the collective memory is to esteem as well as to nurture the group members. To esteem, reproducing the past events can touch the members, and make the unorganized long memory to be short and complete. By doing so the memory gives the confidence to the members that they now have presumably more accurate memories. In biblical accounts, however, we have occasionally experienced that memories are handed down in a more glorious and didactic way, not in an objectively accurate historical memory. "To nurture the members" means to evoke the members by revisiting the painful memory of the past which would be obscured or blurred. One of the examples is the 9-11 ceremony in USA to evoke the tragic memory in other people who were not directly involved.[238]

Regarding the critical spatial theory, Halbwachs argues that sacred places fix the social group's interest and identity. Therefore, even if there would be great changes, only if such a sacred landmark exists, the group can keep the identity. So, the huge stone or even ruined walls like Jerusalem's Western walls still bring its group together in one place and function as a point

---

[236] Durkheim, "From the Elementary Forms of Religious Life," 138.

[237] Durkheim, "From the Elementary Forms of Religious Life," 317.

[238] Lucy Bond, *Frames of Memory after 9/11: Culture, Criticism, Politics, and Law*, Palgrave Macmilian Memory Studies (London: Palgrave Macmilian, 2015), especially see chapter 3 "Analogical Holocaust Memory after 9/11."

to which members may return.[239] Although the concrete or symbolic elements are already fixed as shown, the interpretation/use/reuse is open. As we shall see, this gives a very important clue that the physical Temple structure was not destructed in the vision of chapters 8-11, and in chapters 40-48 the same spectator Ben Adam could recognize the building structure, though the utterance of "Jerusalem" seems to be prohibited.

One of Halbwachs' contributions on critical spatiality is that he inserts the collective memory to the critical spatiality. By locating the memory, he freezes the time to the space, in effective ways of opening the memory for the public interpretation, whether the members accept or resist the proposed collective memory. According to Halbwachs, sacredness is the most intimately related to the experience. Sacredness makes the past experience and also future expectation. In *Legendary Topography*, he argues that knowledge of the past is literally cartographic.[240]

As Pamela Barmash points out, collective memory, if it is especially related to the tragic event, has an eternal or essential truth to the group. Thus, she argues that the ancient Israelites created a usable past, e.g., Exodus, by "re-experiencing" rather than remembering from afar. The Israelites remembered their past history in order to shape their current history into a pattern that would allow them to make a future history. Memory rituals periodically refreshed the immediacy and reality of the Exodus. The Passover ritual was recounted in detail not for antiquarian interest but for dramatizing a memory.[241]

---

[239] Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory* (New York: Harper & Row, 1980).

[240] Halbwachs, "Legendary Topography," in *The Collective Memory*, 170-90.

[241] Pamela Barmash, "Out of the Mists of History: The Exaltation of the Exodus in the Bible," in *Exodus in the Jewish Experience: Echoes and Reverberations,* ed. Pamela Barmash and W. David Nelson (New York: Lexington Books. 2015), 6.cf. note 31.

Social memories can be grounded in the past reality but need not to be; some collective

memories can be created to give a group a common past and sense of shared identity.[242] The

effectiveness of the memory does not lie in the effectiveness of the accurate discernment. Rather,

its goal is to look at how the religious community could get the strong self-identity by reading

the text together.[243]

When we attempt to see how Ezekiel/the book of Ezekiel first attempts to shake, correct,

and obliterate the old space (Jerusalem) in the memory of the exilic community (chapters 4, 8-11,

16, 23, and 33 are several examples), Halbwachs' "Collective Memory" will be substantially

discussed for this consultation.

2.4.3 Nostalgia: Present and Past, or Here and There

"Nostalgia" is a unique term related to both memory and space. In terms of the temporal

matter, nostalgia appears to be connected with the past, but as I quoted in the beginning of this

study, the past and the future are inter-dependent each other, especially in the book of Ezekiel.

Nietzsche also emphasizes the philosophical meaning of forgetting; especially "active

forgetting" has the meaning of selective remembering for the beneficial present and future.[244]

Linda S. Bishai explains this kind of forgetting as the liberation of the past history for the

---

[242] John S. Rickard, *Joyce's Book of Memory: The Mnemotechnic of* Ulysses (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1999), 12-25.

[243] Diana Vikander Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi, *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), Introduction, xix.

[244] Frederich Nietzsche, *Untimely Mediations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 60-61.

"recognition of the alternative future."[245] David Harvey also challenges the traditional notion of the flow of time and memory, arguing that "all those manifestations of place-bound nostalgias" are memorized not as flow but as experienced places and spaces so that the spatial images in the poetic collective memory wins over history.[246] If the discussion moves to Jacques Derrida's notion of the structuralist panoramic vision, the time becomes more explicitly perceived as non-linear, but temporality itself is understood at least as a way in "classical categories of history."[247]

In this sense, the destroyed city is not just a deserted place with no inhabitants alive but the object of people's obsession with meanings and cultures added anew.[248] Andreas Huyssen articulates more on the function of memory which can make the image of the abandoned city a haunted space for the future alternative use. What is interesting in Huyssen's study is his equal emphasis on the "forgetting" matter for a new collective image of the city.[249] This is clearly connected to the spatial study of the book of Ezekiel, especially appearing in Ezekiel 8-11 as making Jerusalem a dystopia.

---

[245] Linda S. Bishai, *Forgetting Ourselves: Secession and (Im)Possiblity of Territorial Identity* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2004), 159. Cf. for the mapping as the present grasping activity, Stuart Elden, *Mapping the Present: Heidegger, Foucault and the Project of a Spatial History* (London and New York: Continuum, 2001).

[246] David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 218; idem, *Spaces of Hope*, 183-85.

[247] Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), lxxxix.

[248] Jacques Derrida, "Force and Signification," in idem, *Writing and Difference,* trans. Alan Bass from French (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 5.

[249] Andreas Huyssen, *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory* (Stanford: Stanford University, 2003), 6-7.

2.5 Summary of the Preliminary Study

From the starting questions and observations regarding the first temple vision in the book of Ezekiel, I have reviewed scholarly works on the book of Ezekiel. As a first part of review, history of interpretations on the book of Ezekiel, the shift of the research on the book through decades has been observed. More specifically, I have reviewed significant scholars' works on diachronic requests, interests in synchronic approach, intertextual studies with other texts, especially within Pentateuch, and comparative study with the ANE parallel documents. With this review, we have come to know that the studies on the book of Ezekiel have shifted from diachronic quests to synchronic interests and various inter-cultural and intertextual studies. This is not a unique phenomenon for the Ezekiel study; rather it is one of the reflections of the postmodern era.

As a second part of review, I have also reviewed interpretations on the chosen text, Ezekiel 8-11. In this review, I have reviewed the shifts of the scholarly interests on the text, too. These two reviews have revealed that the study of the temporal, spatial, and communicative issues in Ezekiel 8-11 has not been reached in a satisfactory level. Moreover, a study of the theological implications of those issues in the book of Ezekiel has not yet been attempted by scholars. These two kinds of review inform us not only the necessity of spatial and discourse analysis of Ezekiel 8-11 but also the possibility of the contribution on the Ezekiel scholarship with this study both methodologically and theologically.

Then, my laying foundation works continue to set up the "flexible" foundations for the diachronic, intertextual, and reader response criticism. In other words, I set the tables for the plausible historical settings of the three texts in the book of Ezekiel. For this, scholarly discussions on the dates of D, P, H, and Ezekiel 8-11 have been briefly introduced. One of the

motives to trace the scholar's works, even though I already knew the clear-cut answers are not possible, lies in my conviction that interpreters should explore back, front, in, and out of the text as much as they can. With this study, I got the "flexible" foundations for the Ezekiel 8-11 reading and well-known sources, D, P, H, which were likely accessible sources for the ancient authors/editors/communities of the three texts. This implies that at least textual-based intertextual reading and possible authorial intertextual reading are eligible.

Then this preliminary study goes on to set up main methodologies for the present study. Form criticism is employed to investigate the intentions of the text and for the foundations of other interdisciplinary interpretations. After reviewing the history of form criticism so far, mainly introducing the relevant achievements for this study, I have introduced the outline of my form critical analysis. Among socio-scientific methods, I have introduced critical spatial theories, utopian/dystopian theories, and the theory of collective memory.

Finally, the preliminary work delves into the discussion of intertextuality both as a method and as an attitude on biblical studies. Based on the fact that we cannot reconstruct the complete history of the traditional development up to the present text, but remaining as a tantalizing goal,[250] I would rather set aside the label "traditio-historical criticism" but take intertextual reading strategy. Intertextual reading now can be divided into at least three areas: authorial, textual, and readerial. With the authorial intertextuality, interpreters seek that what the author of the text read in other texts in front of him and how he interpreted and adopted. But, if we need to admit that the innumerable factors of transmission history in between the mother text and the

---

[250] The term "tradition" is a combined term of "traditum" as what is transmitted and "tradition" as the process of transmission. With this concept, tradition-historical criticism sets its goal as to trace all possible history of the tradition up to the given text in front of the interpreter. Thus, this study includes both the investigations of verbal materials from oral materials which Form Criticism seeks and written materials which Source Criticism reconstructs. Nicholas Turner, *Handbook for Biblical Studies* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1982), 136-37.

received text would not be completely reconstructed in the interpreter's knowledge, interpreters should be satisfied with the comparison of the two texts with the interpreters' own evaluations. Of course, in this authorial intertextuality, interpreters start with the convictions of the directions of influence through the diachronic investigations of the two texts. But, unlike the tradition-historical critics who seek the "jewelries" which are scattered behind the two comparative texts, interpreters of authorial intertextuality focus their interests on imagining the logical/emotional/volitional movement of the author of the present text with the presupposition that the mother text must be available to him.

Textual intertextuality and authorial intertextuality share many things, including the thorough investigations on the two texts. But the former does not suggest the picture of each influence while the latter attempts to explain the reason of the similarities and differences on the specific issues. Meanwhile, my thesis is the result of my reader-response criticism, with the contextualized authorial reading and textualized readerial reading. It is I the reader of the book of Ezekiel with the given texts and other texts together, as well as the various earlier reader-response fruits (e.g., many ancient and contemporary commentaries and articles). Thus, all three realms of intertextual reading should not be applied mechanically and in a rigid manner though the three are visibly distinct.

The adjective "flexible" in the title of this chapter may first give confusion or burden to the interpreters and even make them frustrated, because they need to carry all the diachronic interests up to the Interpretation. Nonetheless, with a flexible attitude with relevant methodologies, the actual practice on synchronic and diachronic approaches on the text would be possible.

Part II Descending to Dystopia

[Form Critical Analysis on Each Unit]

My demarcation of the pericope or self-contained unit is determined by two principles: the inclusive concern and the exclusive concern. The former comes from the task of searching for the coherent connections within the pericope, so it is better to unpack in each individual unit discussion than here.

Accordingly, here the demarcation notes will mainly deal with the latter concern: how Ezekiel 8-11 is distinct from its preceding and succeeding units in terms of both formal and thematic criteria. First, Ezekiel 8-11 is located right after the divine command of the sign-act prophecies of chapters 4-7, in which Ben Adam was also commanded to prophesy about the fall of Jerusalem. Nonetheless, as Sweeney notes, Ezekiel 8 begins with the clear demarcating outset with the introductory chronological formula.[251] The final words of the previous unit in chapter 7 show no closing statement, but the content shows its end (7:27) with the typical recognition formula, "They shall know that I am YHWH", working as the result/purpose of all previously attested events.

Now, an explicit chronological formula after 8:1 does not appear until Ezek. 20:1, which suggests that one should handle Ezekiel 8-19 as one unit, if she sets up the chronological framework as the most noticeable formal marker.[252] Nonetheless, the bulk of this big unit has several sub-units including chapters 8-11, the first temple vision, which is clearly distinguished

---

[251] Sweeney, *Reading Ezekiel*, 51.

[252] Based on this chronological formula as the sign of the new unit, Sweeney sees the self-contained unit as Ezekiel 8:1-19:14 (Sweeney, *Reading Ezekiel*, 51). I agree with this chronological division of the structure, but now in dealing with the temple and the city relationship, it is enough to set up Ezekiel 8-11 as one unit to discuss. Its genre, the vision, provides the clear-cut demarcation of this unit.

from other realistic prophetic oracles. Part II of the present study, Descending to Dystopia, will therefore deal with Ezekiel 8-11 as a sub unit of Ezekiel 8-19 and the counterpart of the final vision, Ezekiel 40-48.

Interestingly, the unit following Ezekiel 8-11, beginning in Ezekiel 12, also begins with the divine command of the sign-act prophecy like the unit preceding Ezekiel 8-11 (Ezekiel 4-7), so that the structure shows readers the following sequence: the sign-act prophecy command (chs. 4-7); the vision (chs. 8-11); the sign-act prophecy (ch. 12) command. In other words, readers[253] may appreciate this first temple vision as another version of the continuing prophecy on the fall of Jerusalem or judgement on Israel. In terms of the structural analysis, the vision in the middle of the sign-act prophecies plays like an audio-visual instrument to enhance the surrounding prophecies. While chapter 7 and chapter 8 are distinct from both the chronological setting and the genre aspect, chapter 11 and chapter 12 are distinct from the delivery methods and the location of the events. If chapter 11 is the concluding unit of the first temple vision which occurs mostly in Jerusalem, chapter 12 clearly sets the narratee or the literary audience as the Babylonian exiles. Thus, Ezekiel 8-11 is distinct from Ezekiel 12, not only in terms of genre, theme, and tone of the text but also in terms of the literary space and audience.

---

[253] I intentionally use the term "reader" here rather than audience/reader since in this case we are not sure that the literary audience of Ben Adam/Ezekiel could appreciate every single divine command of prophecies to listen. Even though the audience could not listen to the performances due to the lack of the fulfillment report, we interpreters are sure that all the information is given to readers as its order. What we have learned from this observation is that the vision in Ezekiel 8-11 is embraced by the divine commands to the prophet Ezekiel. Both prophecies in chapter 7 and in chapter 12 do not have the fulfillment formula, which suggest the discrepancy between the implied readers and the literary audience/narratee regarding the acknowledgement or the minimum information for the communication.

In addition to the exclusive concern, however, I need to point out that all the visions included within this unit are also coherently related to the other visions as well as other realistic presentations in the book of Ezekiel.

The main task of Part II is to examine the dystopian aspects of the first temple vision based on the close reading of the text. In order to appreciate multiple dimensions of Ezekiel 8-11, this study employs several methodologies including advanced form critical analysis, spatial theory, intertextual reading, and narrative theory focused on the discourse analysis. With the inclusive characteristics of advanced form criticism, this chapter follows the framework of form critical analysis, i.e., Structure, Genres and Languages, Settings, and Interpretations, with the flexible consultation of each section.[254]

In doing form critical analysis, the structural analysis should be done first. As Tyler Mayfield argues, the literary settings which the interpreter finds from the text depend on her understandings of the structure of the text. Depending on one's structural analysis presentation, the text is reshaped into unique units and subunits, and can therefore be reread.[255] Most discussions on semantic and syntactic peculiarities of each verse in the text, both in content and form, will be discussed in the Structure section. Depending on the unique form of the sub-units, sometimes discussions will be focused more toward the compositional strategies based on the distances in communication between the implied author and the implied reader; but character and characterizations will be also discussed when necessary.

---

[254] Structure would be in the first position in order to examine the uniqueness of the unit. On the contrary, regarding Settings and Genres-Languages, I will consider the logical flow of my presentation and would change their orders. 2.3.1.1 First It Brought Me is an example.

[255] Tyler D. Mayfield, *Literary Structure and Setting in Ezekiel* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 9.

In Genres and Languages, I will focus on several genre discussions, including disputations, prophetic speeches, the vision report as a first-person tour, etc. For the features of sign-act languages used in this vision, I will employ Harald Schweizer's linguistic methods of both illocutionary and perlocutionary aspects of language in order to appreciate how those languages make the vision a more drama-like narrative.

Settings are divided into the literary/rhetorical settings, historical/social settings, and reader's settings. Traditionally Historical and Social Settings in form criticism were designated for more diachronic discussions in seeking the compositional situations and possible redactional touches that led up to the present form of the text. Since I already introduced the diachronic issues and compositional histories of this text in chapter 1, I will not spend much time for this matter here, unless significant seams of the text draw our attention. Rather, I will examine how the memories and agendas of the Babylonian exilic community—the implied author—would influence the shaping of the historical settings of the vision and how the specific social settings, shaped by specific languages and syntactical contexts would show the possible reconnection with the present text; and how the Ezekiel text might attempt to claim the successor of the earlier traditions.

In Reader's Settings, I will study the complicated relationships among the implied author, narrator, character, and the implied audience. I will especially examine how the reading would be different if this homodiegetic vision account was read along with the larger context, i.e., the self-effacing third-person unknown narrator in Ezekiel 1:2-3, who in fact governs the whole account under the surface level of the text. In terms of looking at the dynamic relationships

among author, narrator, character, narratee, reader as the sender group, sent objects, and receiver group, this examination is also closely related to the discourse analysis which I addressed in Introduction. Setting is also the section in which I will explore the larger context in the book of Ezekiel.

Interpretation of the form critical analysis on Ezekiel 8-11 will be mainly unpacked in Part III, situating the four chapters of the first temple vision in the whole book of Ezekiel. This Interpretation will focus on three related topics in reading the first temple vision—temporal, spatial, and communicative—in order to draw the ideological intensions and theological implications. For the fuller interpretations and for avoiding redundant discussions, I will not include Interpretation sections in the discussion of the individual sections.

CHAPTER 3. Set up for a Vision Narrative (8:1-8:3a)

3.1. Ready to Listen (8:1a)

Ready to Listen: Introduction of the Narrator and Narratee (8:1a)

Setting for the vision narrative: (time; place; narrator; narrate)   8:1a

3.1.1 Structure

In this first verse of the vision, we have a critical textual issue regarding the date. While

MT reads "in the sixth month" (בַּשִּׁשִׁי), the Old Greek reads "in the fifth month" (ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ)

in 8:1. As Daniel Block explains Old Greek's reading might come from the translator's

mishearing influenced by "fifth day,"[256] I will remain the reading of MT presentation.

[The Narratee-Character]

The text clearly identifies the narratee of the vision narrative as the elders of Judah.

Regarding these elders, I prefer the term "narratee" or "literary audience" rather than an oral

performance term "audience" because "audience" can often refer to the implied audience who

might not be a character within the narrative. However, Ezekiel 8-11 starts its story with

identifiable characters who play as a narratee group. It is true that the elders as the literary

audience are passive and become almost part of the background of the story. This setting indeed

pushes the authorial audience/reader to have a similar attitude to the literary audience, such as no

doubtful challenge to the divine revelation in reading this story.[257] In the first-person narrative

---

[256] Block, *Ezekiel 1-24*, 276 n.13.

[257] Richard J. Gerrig, "A Moment-by Moment Perspective on Readers' Experiences of

Characters" in *Characters in Fictional Worlds*, *Understanding Imaginary Beings in Literature,*

form, the author often attempts to get empathy from his readers, encourages them to imitate the

first-person character-narrator, and finally wishes the readers to be mingled into the narrator's

realm.[258] In the reader's perspective, since a first-person narrative has a stronger preference of

the written form like one's diary than a third person narrative, readers often find themselves as

those who sneak to someone's private chamber and watch not-allowed scenes. If the story is

about visions, secrets, and prophecies, like our text or apocalyptic discourses, the reader's

excitement on sharing the secret matters would be increased by the use of a first-person narrative.

Moreover, restricting the narrator-character Ben Adam's freedom of criticism makes it easier for

the implied author to get the neutral reader to become the authorial reader by the imitation of the

attitude of the main character, Ben Adam.[259]

Despite their silence from the beginning to end (thus, they look like a part of the

background of the story), the elders of Judah are the interlocutor of the whole vision account.

Scenery of the sitting elders at the exiled priest-prophet's house is not an ordinary setting but a

possible ritualistic setting for the divine inquiry.[260] For this reason, it would be helpful to read

the text along with imaginative inquiries of the exiled elders. In other words, apparently arbitrary

---

Film, and Other Media, ed. Jens Eder, Fotis Jannidis, and Ralf Schneider (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 365-69.

[258] Cf. Henrik Skov Nielsen, "The Impersonal Voice of First-Person Narrative Fiction," *Narrative* 12, no. 2 (2004): 133-50.

[259] Phelan, *Living to Tell It*, Appendix, 205.

[260] Cf. Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 138-40.

movements or scenes in Ezekiel 8-11 might be the underlying reflections of the implied questions which the narratee and the narrator share. If the text on the underlying level resembles a Questions & Answers setting, frequent quotations of the people's sayings in various disputative scenes also can be understood as such. I will not take this Q&A option in making structure due to the too much subtle remarks on the text, but I would like to point out that flexible reading as an active shaping of the meaning can take this alternate structure, too.

[The Narrator-Character]

In this vision account as well as in other units, our narrator is a homodiegetic narrator who is identical with the character in the story. But, as Sweeney points out, the whole book of Ezekiel clearly shows the existence of an unknown heterodiegetic narrator as we see in Ezekiel 1:3, "the word of YHWH came to Ezekiel the priest, the son of Buzi, in the land of the Chaldeans by the Chebar canal, and the hand of YHWH was upon him there."[261] This fact challenges readers to consider the distance between the character and the narrator as well as between the narrator and readers. I will delve into this topic more in the Reader's Setting section; for now it is enough for us to know that this first temple vision account is told by the character-narrator, i.e., a homodiegetic narrator, who is called Ben Adam by another main character, YHWH. According to Chatman's diagram, we now identify at least two entities: Ezekiel 8-11 is the vision account of the character-narrator (Ben Adam) to the character-narratee (elders of Judah in Babylon).[262] As we shall recognize more and more, the traditional classification of "the narrator = the character"

---

[261] Sweeney, *Reading Ezekiel*, 76.

[262] Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 267.

118

in the first-person narrative should be seriously reconsidered since, in this ancient text, we will

see the author's different treatment of Ben Adam the character and Ben Adam the narrator.

3.1.1.2 Genres and Languages

As discussed, the prose form and explicit time framework with the narrator and narratee

show that the genre of Ezekiel 8-11 is a narrative or at least an account.[263] More specific

clarification will be possible in the next unit, but this unit sets up the necessary arrangement with

a loose ritualistic language, i.e., two parties are sitting before each other to wait for something

(אֲנִי יוֹשֵׁב בְּבֵיתִי וְזִקְנֵי יְהוּדָה יוֹשְׁבִים לְפָנַי). The captives appear to be ready to listen to the divine oracle,

though the oracle will not come the way they expect to tell the prompt return to the land.

3.1.1.3 Settings

As we briefly confirmed in the Demarcation notes above, the first clause of 8:1a shows

the temporal and spatial settings of the vision with the introduction of the main characters. Its

time, "the sixth year, in the sixth month, on the fifth day of the month," (8:1a) shows the

continuity from the first vision setting as well as the author's preference for the Jehoiachin-exile

oriented setting. It implicates the implied reader of the book of Ezekiel must be those who are

familiar to the calculation of this calendar, but at the same time, as Dalit Rom-Shiloni notes, the

---

[263] James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz, *A Companion to Narrative Theory*, Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture 54 (Oxford: Wiley, 2005). See also Sweeney, *Isiah 1-39* for the biblical genre definitions and examples.

division of the conflict between those who remain in the land of Israel and those who left the land is serious in this first temple vision, too.[264]

3.2 Ready to Tell (8:1b-8:3a)

Ready to Tell: Introduction of the Moving Character YHWH (8:1b-8:3a)

a. Abstract introduction of YHWH: The hand of YHWH   8:1b
b. [Interruptive description] YHWH's appearance using similes   8:2
c. Resuming the "hand" of YHWH: hand as the transportation method of the journey   8:3a

3.2.1 Structure

This unit is a continuing introduction with 8:1a but distinct in terms of the appearance of the moving character YHWH in the scene. While the scene of 8:1a works as the initial ground of the vision account, this unit makes the static scene move toward the active events. The unit stops at 8:3a, the moment before the departure from the house of Ben Adam in Babylonia to the house of YHWH in Jerusalem. In other words, the character-narrator Ben Adam stays on the ground level in this unit.

Again, we encounter the different readings of 8:2b between MT and LXX. While the MT reads וְהִנֵּה דְמוּת כְּמַרְאֵה־אֵשׁ, the LXX has ἰδοὺ ὁμοίωμα ἀνδρός. Hiebel opens the two possibilities: as the misspelling of either LXX or MT from the same Hebrew Vorlage; or as the intentional change due to the intention of avoiding an anthropomorphic description of the deity.[265] Most English translations appear to prefer the Greek reading. ESV, NAB, NAS, NAU, NIV, NLT,

---

[264] See for the general overview of exilic and postexilic parties in ancient Israel and its surrounding diaspora. Dalit Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity: Identity Conflicts between the Exiles and the People Who Remained (6th-5th Centuries BCE)*, LHB/OTS (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013); idem, "Jerusalem and Israel, Synonyms or Antonyms? Jewish Exegesis of Ezekiel's Prophecies against Jerusalem," in *After Ezekiel: Essays on the Reception of a Difficult Prophet*, ed. Andrew Mein and Paul Joyce (London & New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 113.

[265] Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives*, 95.

NRS follow the Greek version "the appearance of a man" while JPS, KJV, and KOR follow the MT reading, "the appearance of fire." Because there is no fully clear trajectory between the two versions, and the fiery image fits well enough to the divine image, I follow the MT reading and translate as "the appearance of fire."

As we see in the formal structure above, verse 2 interrupts the flow of the narrator's introduction of the hand of YHWH by describing the appearance of YHWH as whole. Those interrupting descriptions are usually marked as [ ] and if it is related to the description of the glory of the God of Israel, it is highlighted in gray color. Technically speaking, this interpretation must be done by the actual author group but it is convenient for us to say that the implied author allows the character Ben Adam to emphasize the continuity of this supernatural vision with his former experience in the first vision (chs.1-3).

An interesting point is made in the unique role of the character as the two focalizers (the character and the narrator) start working distinctively from each other in this introductory scene. According to Phelan, focalization is none but to the matter of perception, so the agent of that activity is a focalizer. The agent, for Phelan, is neither necessarily a single party nor limited to the character. In other words, according to Phelan's analysis, even in the first-person narrative we see clear different roles between the identical narrator and character.[266] Norman Friedman also supports the character-narrator's role in the narrative. In making a complex classification of eight terms regarding the point of view, Friedman refers "I" as a witness to the action viewed from the periphery by a narrator who is also a secondary character.[267]

---

[266] Phelan, *Living to Tell It*, 98-102.

[267] Norman Friedman, "Point of View in Fiction: The Development of a Critical Concept" *PMLA* 70, no. 5 (1955): 1160-84.

How about our case? Can we see the distinct roles or tasks of the apparently identical Ben Adam character and Ben Adam narrator? My answer is, yes we do see distinct roles. Ben Adam as the first-person homodiegetic narrator wants to lead his readers forward to the main stream of the story, while Ben Adam as the first-person observing and experiencing character, who will be led by the stronger character of YHWH, often stops the narrative flow to describe the surprising moments at his experienced level. Accordingly, it is wise for us readers to set our reading strategy to distinguish the functions between the narrator and the character, even though they appear identical within the framework of the first-person narrative.

In other words, there are two streams or vehicles to lead the plot of this vision: one is the narrator's report on the movement and events; the other is the character's self-disclosure in his new discoveries. Form critical analysis should recognize these two streams and appreciate the relationships accordingly. Between the two, I observe that the text weighs more on the plot movement in chapters 8 and 9, the portion of the reasoning of the departure of the glory, probably to show the reasons of the divine abandonment due to the abominations in Jerusalem and the temple. These two chapters indeed follow the national judgment oracle form which contains the accusations and the judgment[268] with the unusual concluding conjunction "וגם" with the first person pronoun "אני."[269] On the contrary, after the heavenly executioners destroyed the city residents, the tendency shifts to depict Ben Adam's focalizations. In my

---

[268] As we shall see in the analysis of chapter 9, the effective genre "vision" makes possible readers see the immediate execution of that judgment, i.e., the destruction of the city Jerusalem and the defilement of the temple.

[269] Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*; Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39*. This phrase in this concluding sense also appears in Exod. 6:5; Jer. 13:26; Ezek. 5:11; 8:18; 16:43; Mic. 6:13; Mal. 2:9. With other typical formula "My eyes will have no pity nor shall I spare," two verses, Ezek. 8:18 and 9:10 show the typical judgment context.

analysis, the principle of the main plot of Ezekiel 8-11 is to follow the moving line in order to tell the events. Thus, any description, emotion, or feelings are to be regarded as the interruption of the main stream in plot development, even though these interruptions provide very important textual moods.

It is also interesting that the latter two chapters of this vision, chs. 10 and 11, follow the form of the oracle of salvation. As I briefly mentioned in "The History of Interpretation on Ezekiel 8-11," chapter 11 has prompted many diachronic discussions regarding redactional issues, due to its apparently awkward and sudden appearance of the salvation oracle. Agreeing with the multiple redaction layers, I would also point out that this structure prompts us to read Ezekiel 8-11 in at least two ways: 1) as a counter-vision of the final vision in Ezekiel 40-48; and 2) as the miniature[270] of the prophetic oracle series, oracles of judgment followed by the oracle of salvation. I will discuss this matter more fully in the "Interpretation" section.

[Character YHWH and Pronouns for Him]

YHWH is another important protagonist. Although he is very active, YHWH is often presented very vaguely, probably due to the fear of anthropomorphic descriptions of the deity. For example, he first appears as the hand of YHWH in 8:1 and as the appearance of fire and a gleaming material figure in 8:2. Then, only his hand appears in the scene in 8:3.[271] Suddenly, right after the introductory statements end, YHWH is replaced by the Spirit, the glory of YHWH, and the pronoun "he."

---

[270] This blueprint type in the early stage is indeed the pattern of the book of Exodus. Exodus 3 already shows everything how the exodus would happen.

[271] See above my reading of 8:2 as the interruption of the main plot movement.

The use of this pronoun continues throughout chapter 8, in which YHWH mainly plays a tour-guide or educator role, more like a human figure.[272] Indeed, this third-person masculine singular pronoun usage and the Spirit together in replacing the proper name YHWH as an agent are also applied to the last temple tour scene in chapter 11, the scene of the wicked counselors. If this is the case, it is understandable why the final vision, Ezekiel 40-48, employs another important character, Bronze Man, as the new temple tour guide. In Ezekiel 40-48, YHWH is depicted more like the king of Israel, as well as the entire universe, with his dignity. The final vision also has an important turning point of the story, the return of the glory of YHWH in ch. 43. Everything, especially the temple structure, should be set up to welcome this returning king of kings. The return of YHWH/the glory of YHWH to his newly remodeled throne is a very significant concept in Ezekiel 40-48, as is his departure from the temple in Ezekiel 8-11. As the furious judge who will soon abandon his city and the temple, YHWH shows his emotions and thoughts through the visible evidence in order to imply that it is YHWH himself, not any other, who decided to purify his land.

Ezekiel 9 is a good example to observe this change. The masculine singular pronoun is finally replaced by the proper name YHWH in Ezekiel 9:4 when YHWH directly calls for his heavenly executioners, "And YHWH said to him, 'Pass through the city, through Jerusalem, and put a mark on the foreheads of the men who sigh and groan over all the abominations that are committed in it.'" This furious deity does not allow the defenders to raise any challenging questions. Negotiation, appeal, repentance, and challenge from the audience (or broadly from human beings) are not available.

---

[272] Hiebel also interprets that the identity of the anonymous guide is YHWH in person. Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives*, 307.

Generally, in the book of Ezekiel, even when the literary audience desperately wants to listen to the oracle further and to react, their attempts seem always to be frustrated. There is not a single example of two-way interactive dialogue among any characters. Throughout the book, the only exception to this one-way monologue is Ezekiel's negative reaction to YHWH's command to eat the human dung in 4:12-15.

3.2.2 Genres and Languages

Now, comparative reading of this first temple vision together with two other visions⸺Ezekiel 1 and 40⸺will enhance our understanding of all three visions. The first temple vision in 8-11 is unique in terms of the explicit spatial setting in the character's departure. Here, the main character stays in his house with the elders of Judah (literary audience). In comparison, the first vision in Ezekiel 1 has no explicit literary audience in front of the main character, although it shows the specific place of the vision as Chaber canal. Ezekiel 40 in the final vision has neither a specific spatial setting nor the existence of a literary audience alongside Ben Adam. The vision in 40 avoids any specific location of his departure; as a result, it gives readers room to imagine the departing place of Ben Adam in 40:1. On the other hand, this final vision is free from the task of delivery, too.

The first temple vision in 8-11 shows a different case. In terms of the delivery issue, this vision must be delivered to the immediate audience, the elders of Judah in 8:1, and it was delivered according to 11:25. Because Ezekiel 8-11 uses the story within the story as the vision account, the text in fact has at least two kinds of an immediate (literary) audience, in addition to the implied audience of the later readers.

In comparison with the final vision, we see Ben Adam's different role in two visions. In the final vision (Ezekiel 40-48), Ben Adam is a passive recipient/character without any comments or questions during the temple tour with the Bronze Man. In this sense, Ben Adam in the final vision resembles the literary audience of the first temple vision in Ezekiel 8-11. In other words, in the final vision, Ben Adam, without the literary audience, also plays the role of the audience, while in the first temple vision Ben Adam reacts as something of a representative for the restricted literary audience.

There are, however, common factors in all three visions in the book of Ezekiel (Ezekiel 1-3; 8-11; and 40-48): the temporal indications. Based on these chronological markers, we can arrange the order of the visions. Interestingly, the first vision and the final vision show a two-fold description of the date, whereas the first temple vision in the middle has only one-fold description. In the first vision, the peculiar standard of counting the date was to some degree ambiguous as "the 30th year" is noted in 1:1 before the specific date, King Jehoiachin's exile, was introduced in 1:2. In the final vision, the same pattern appears in that the time after the fall of Jerusalem is added to the Jehoiachin exilic calendar. In the middle, the temporal setting in 8:1 briefly mentions the date and expects readers to supply further contextual information taken from the previous and subsequent visions in the book. Another coherent element between the visions can be found in the possible Akkadian loan word[273] "gleaming metal" (חשמל) in 8:2.[274] It

---

[273] Nissinen, "(How) Does the Book of Ezekiel Reveal Its Babylonian Context?" 94-95.

[274] For discussion of the meaning of the term חשמל, see Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, Johann Jakob Stamm, Benedikt Hartmann, Ze'Ev Ben-Hayyim, and Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 362.

appeared two times in the first vision (1:4 and 1:27) for the same description of the divine

manifestation.

3.2.3 Settings

[Spirit, Vision, and Word: *Sitz im Leben* and the prophetic traditions]

In this section, I will consult the possible historical backgrounds in general and connected

traditions of this vision. First, in respect to Spirit, James Robson argues that רוח gives authority

to Ezekiel's ministry.[275] From the two formulas, "the word of YHWH came upon me" (a typical

Prophetic Word Formula) and "the Spirit lifted me up," we can conjecture the social setting of

the text in terms of its connection to the earlier prophetic tradition of Moses, Elijah, and Elisha.

Unlike the earliest tradition, we find a complete absence of רוח in the classical prophets.

Scholars have paid attention to these contrasting pictures regarding רוח as two fundamentally

different historical realities. For example, Keith W. Carley argues that the dependence on the

earlier tradition rather than immediate past as shown in classical prophetic books is a necessary

matter for Ezekiel's ministry to make firm his authority and authenticity.[276] Zimmerli also

expresses this unique phenomenon of רוח in Ezekiel as being very archaic since the

terminologies, including the Spirit "lifts" the prophet, "carries" him away, "falls" upon him or

---

[275] James Robson, *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel* (New York: T&T Clark International, 2006), 101.

[276] Zimmerli, "The Special Form- and Traditio-Historical Character," 516-17; Carley, *Ezekiel Among the Prophets*, 73.

"transports" him, were common among the early, pre-classical prophets.[277] In terms of the

historical-social setting, a possible explanation would be that use of the Spirit as a main plot

mover may reflect the necessity of the Babylonian exilic community to search for more flexible

access to the divine revelation, as was found in early, pre-classical prophetic traditions.[278]

Second, vision is a popular tool of the prophetic experience of God throughout prophetic

literature, including prophets such as Balaam, Elisha, Isaiah, Amos, Jeremiah, and Zechariah.

Accordingly, the two visions in the book of Ezekiel should be read as a common method to

receive divine oracles.

Third, while this "vision" method is spread throughout the prophetic literature, the "word

of God' formula appeared more in the classical writing prophets through the auditorial manner.

In other words, the communication in messenger formula is not a mystical union with YHWH

who enables the prophet to speak his message in the first person as the very word of Yahweh, but

the relationship of a messenger to a sender, a relationship that puts words in the messenger's

mouth. Robson interprets this peculiar phenomenon as the effort of the self-authentication and

the expression of Ezekiel as a model for the addressees of the book.[279]

---

[277] Zimmerli, *Old Testament Theology in Outline*, trans. David E. Green (Edinburgh, Scotland: John Knox Press, 1978), 100-102.

[278] Robson, *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*, 99-100.

[279] Robson, *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*, 24.

CHAPTER 4. Jerusalem in the Vision: Round Trip from Chaldea to Jerusalem (8:3b-11:24)

Now, the journey starts from 8:3b and ends in 11:24 when Ben Adam comes back to his house. Ezekiel 11:25, the last verse of chapter 11, is excluded from this tour unit because this last verse is the statement of the report of the journey to the interlocutors, the elders of Judah. This unit of 8:3b-11:24 is divided into three sub-units according to the formal structure by which the Spirit leads Ben Adam through supernatural movement. These movements are marked by the form "The Spirit lifted me up" (וַתִּשָּׂא אֹתִי רוּחַ). The overall structure of the vision shows that there are three occurrences of "The Spirit lifted me up" (וַתִּשָּׂא אֹתִי רוּחַ) and six instances of "And he/it brought me" (וַיָּבֵא/וַתָּבֵא אֹתִי) In all three occurrences (8:3b; 11:1; 11: 24b) which both clauses appear together, the subject of the verb "to bring" becomes a third-person feminine singular instead of a third-person masculine singular, to match its subject with the Spirit. However, when the clause "And he brought me" appears, it uses a third-person masculine singular pronoun "he" instead of using the proper name YHWH as I mentioned earlier. Both supernatural and natural movement forms should be understood as the two basic division markers since the sub-units according to these formal divisions also serve for the content/thematic distinctions[280]. The first sub-unit/movement is from Babylon to Jerusalem; the second sub-unit/movement is from the inner-court of the temple to the east gate[281] with the

---

[280] We need a further discussion for the second "Lift Me Up" function in 11:1 which shows both diachronic markers and a slightly different movement in the vision. See 4.2. Second "Spirit Lifted me Up".

[281] Apparently, movement from the inner court of the temple to the east gate does not seem to need the supernatural movement by the Spirit. However, we can understand this in two

interruption of the plot line by introducing the glory of YHWH again in chapter 10;[282] and the

third sub-unit/movement is from Jerusalem back to the captives in Babylon.

Further, we find six sub-units which show the Spirit/YHWH in the pronoun form leading

Ben Adam with ground-level movement. These units are marked by the expression "he brought

me" (וַיָּבֵא אֹתִי).[283] This typical expression makes the temple/city tour in vision possible, since this

transporting verb בוא functions as the opening of the scenes of greater abominations in the city

and the temple. This suggests that the tour follows the gradation of the seriousness in

abomination, no matter where the disgusting events happen. Therefore, if one expects logical

directions from north to south or east to west, that expectation would be frustrated since the logic

would follow not the geographical directions but the theological and psychological directions

from Ezekiel/YHWH's perspective. Along with this gradational literary device, readers

encounter several crucial scenes including the destruction of Jerusalem, the divine wrath in the

speech, and departure of the glory.

---

ways: one as to show psychological distance from the open space to the secret site which shows
the abominable deeds are practiced in a very confidential way; or it reflects God's fiery against
the abominable scene and his omniscient and omnipotent power.

[282] Both ways of reading are possible: if we see the condemnation in ch. 9 as the main
line, then chapter 10 of the glory scene would be the insertion. But, if we see the glory and the
divine theophany as the main line, the spirit movement to the twenty five men scene is the
interruption before the report is resumed in 11:22. This spirit lift scene in 11:1 gives a clear
motive to God to depart/abandon the City Jerusalem and the different treatment in the restoration
plan in 11:14-21.

[283] Cf. 8:3 uses the 3fs form of the verb since the agent is the Spirit, a feminine singular
noun.

4.1 First "The Spirit Lifted Me UP": from Babylon to Jerusalem (8:3b-10:22)

4.1.1 Divine Accusations and Judgment: Ezekiel (8:3b-18)

4.1.1.1 First "It Brought Me": Arrival at Jerusalem (8:3b-8:6)

a. [Narrator's focalization] on the jealousy-provoking image:

Description of the north gate around   8:3b
b. [Character's focalization] on discovery of the glory of YHWH   8:4

  ① Emphasis of the coexistence of the glory and the jealous image   8:4a

  ② Emphasis of the connection of the experience in Babylon   8:4b

c. Narrator's report of the new information through the divine command

and character's obedience   8:5-6
  ① Divine command to look northward   8:5a

    a) Divine speech formula   8:5aα

    b) Speech per se   8:5aβ

  ② Ben Adam's Obedience   8:5b

    a) Report of the Obedience   8:5bα

    b) Ben Adam the Character's recognition of the image   8:5bβ

  ③ Divine Education #1 using Ben Adam's visual experience   8:6

    a) Divine speech formula   8:6aα

    b) Speech per se   8:6aβ-6bγ

      i. Confirmative rhetorical question for Ben Adam's understanding   8:6aβ

      ii. The consequential decision of YHWH to depart his sanctuary   8:6bα

      iii. Leading to the next movement to show "greater" abominations   8:6bβ-γ

4.1.1.1.1 Structure

    This unit shows the first movement on the ground level after the supernatural

transportation by the Spirit. In the description of the journey, the author uses the narrator's and

character's focalization respectively. Starting from the Spirit's transportation of Ben Adam to

Jerusalem, this unit ends with YHWH's introductory/transitional speech to move to the next

scene. The moving verb בוא covers this unit (8:3b-8:6) until the second בוא appears in 8:7. As usual, the author uses the narrator to draw the character's and readers' attention together. In other words, Ben Adam has three distinct functions, though sometimes the categories are very subtle: 1) Ben Adam as the narrator plays a representative of the implied author; 2) Ben Adam as the character plays a first-person experiencing character with more limitations than both Ben Adam the narrator and YHWH the character; and 3) Ben Adam also plays as a representative of the literary audience/implied reader. The third role is not explicitly manifested on the surface level of the text but can be noticed in the context. With this preliminary observation, I can say that this unit mainly deals with the new discovery of Ben Adam the character who stands as the representative of the implied reader/the literary narratee. Also, this unit functions as the introduction to the rest of the didactic tour in chapter 8 as well as to the whole first temple vision in Ezekiel 8-11. Two key words for this unit would be "jealous image" and "abominations."

[Narrator's Focalization (8:3b)]

One may wonder of my division between the character Ben Adam and the narrator Ben Adam within the first person narrative, since the traditional narrative analysis might not distinguish the two concepts. However, as Phelan proposes, the narrative itself sometimes shows the different perspectives and expressions from the different focalizations. Phelan argues that when a character serves as a narrator, the consequences will be manifested on both sides: the character narrator and the character itself.[284] Rimmon-Kenan also points out that one of the indirect means of characterization is the character's narration or speech.[285]

---

[284] Phelan, "Why Narrators Can be Focalizers," 51-64.

[285] Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, 63.

With the first "he/it brought me" introductory sentence, the narrator tells the reader that he arrives at the place where the jealous image was located. The replacement of the ambiguous expression with "The Spirit" shows the constant effort to avoid the anthropomorphic description of YHWH and suggests the coherence of the linguistic/literary concerns.

Ezekiel 8:3b has brought many scholarly conjectures regarding its location.[286] For example, Bruce Vawter and Leslie Hoppe in their commentary on the book of Ezekiel argue that Ezekiel was standing between the two gates of the outer courtyard of the temple. Further, they explain that this gateway is not a simple gate but a substantial building which has "inner walls and partitions, side room, windows, and entrances fore and aft." It is, according to this view, a part of the wall which connected to the temple-palace complex as YHWH criticizes in Ezekiel 43:7-8.[287]

Vawter and Hoppe's realistic explanation would help us to understand the structure of the temple and the city complex. At this point, we should admit that the narrator treats "Jerusalem" almost as a synonym of "the Temple in Jerusalem." Consideration of the similar pattern in the closing statement in 11:24 would give some insight in understanding the relationship between Jerusalem and the gateway to the north. In 11:24, we read that the Spirit brought Ben Adam to

---

[286] For example, Bruce Vawter and Leslie J. Hoppe, *A New Heart: A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 64-65. The authors argue that this is "the northern gate of Jerusalem which opened upon the temple area." They also argue that in 8:7, God tells Ezekiel first to turn around and enter the gateway to the inner court to the temple. However, the text appears not so supportive for this conjecture because Ben Adam does not move his body to look at the jealous image.

[287] Vawter and Hoppe, *A New Heart*, 64-65.

Chaldea, to the exiles. When we read the context, we come to know that the relationship between Chaldea and the dwelling place of exiles, especially the house of Ben Adam should be supplementary rather than to refer to the two separate places. By the same token, Jerusalem and the gateway should be understood with the former as a broader term and the latter as the specific spot in Ben Adam's journey. Thus, we do not necessarily choose either the gateway in Jerusalem or the gateway in the temple for the clarification of Ben Adam's first location. It is more likely to be analogous in our day with an airport scene when the airplane approaches from the air to the specific city and soon to the specific spot of the airport. If the narrator narrates that scene, he would mention the city name first and then point out the specific spot, but almost simultaneously. Two implications come up from this observation. First, the narrator's desire for this focalization on the city and the temple is very serious so that he cannot keep the temporal order of the recounting. Accordingly, in 8:3b, it is true that Ben Adam arrived at Jerusalem; but at the same time or soon after, the character is depicted as though he was standing at the entrance of the northern gateway of the inner-court of the temple. Of course, it is impossible in the natural law situation, but it is possible in the visionary situation under the supernatural law.[288]

In terms of the insufficient adjective "the inner" (הַפְּנִימִית) without following nouns, like "the court of the house" in 8:3, scholars have proposed several opinions. First of all, ancient translators (LXX) showed its difficulty by omitting this verse. Zimmerli follows LXX option with the reason of the gender of this adjective not matching with the masculine singular noun

---

[288] Vawter and Hoppe also guide us not to "press either the chronology or the logic" from this vision since scenes are flowing as though a dream flows freely. Vawter and Hoppe, *A New Heart*, 68.

"gate" שַׁעַר,[289] while Ernst Vogt conjectures that originally there was a masculine form (without

the last ת), meaning the "inner" (i.e. south) entrance of the gate complex.[290] In fact, this

phenomenon is not strange in the narrative study. James Phelan explains this strategy as

"suppressed narration" that does not provide crucial information, e.g. the transition moment of

the location change as we see in Ezekiel 8, and thereby creates "either a gap in the text that

cannot be filled or a discrepancy between what is reported in one place and not reported in

another."[291]

As a second implication, the narrator's indiscriminate treatment of the city and the temple

in the beginning of the tour also reflects the underlying theological concept of the book that the

destiny and function of the sacred city depend on the service for the temple. The city and the

temple, as long as the temple is in the city, share the same fate. Like the gradation of the detailed

expression in verses 1b through 3a for the man-like figure, later revealed as God in this verse, the

narrator uses a gradational kind of literary device as he gradually reveals the spot of Ezekiel's

first station. This gradual revelation is a very typical literary device in the book of Ezekiel. With

this verse, "the gateway of the inner court that faces north" in verse 3b was revealed as the gate

of the altar or the "altar gate." If this is the main stream of the report line by the narrator Ben

Adam, the author allows the character Ben Adam often to stop the stream to detail his own

experience through the first vision in Chaber canal, probably to appeal to his exilic narratee. In

---

[289] Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 217.

[290] Ernst Vogt, *Untersuchungen Zum Buch Ezechiel,* AnBib 95 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press. 1981), 43.

[291] Phelan, *Living to Tell It,* 138.

this case, the author inserts the scene of the glory of YHWH in verse 4. The implied author

allows this because he needs the appearance of YHWH as the tour guide. Interestingly, a similar

narrative situation or strategy appears in chapter 9. There, too, the glory of YHWH is expressed

to make the narrative environment as the court where the universal king's judgement will be

proclaimed.

As prevailed throughout the book, we see this application in the introductory scene of the

temple tour. If we are not aware of this device, we may spend effort in drawing the map of Ben

Adam's temple tour which will give us an unfruitful result. Carl Gross for example argues that

Ezekiel was in the northern gate of the temple precinct, but, to my consideration, Gross amended

the text by inserting Ezekiel turning his body to the south to make himself enable to see the

"great abominations" in 8:5.[292]

[Identity of "The seat of the image of jealousy" (8:3b; 8:5b)]

Curiosity about the identity of the "seat of the image of jealousy" has provoked several

conjectures.[293] William F. Albright sees that seat as the form of a niche in the wall on which the

jealous images can be carved or drawn.[294] While Theodore H. Gaster pays attention to the

---

[292] Carl D. Gross, "Ezekiel and Solomon's Temple," *The Bible Translator* 50, no. 2 (1999): 207-14.

[293] For the review of interpretations on this issue, see Margaret. S. Odell, "What Was the Image of Jealousy in Ezekiel 8?" in *The Priests in the Prophets. The Portrayal of Priests, Prophets and Other Religious Specialists in the Latter Prophets,* ed. L. L. Grabbe and Alice Ogden Bellis, JSOTSup 408 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 134-48, especially, 134-37. With the reviews of the discussion, she rather focuses on its function as "a type of votive statue" based on the Phoenician usage of the term "jealousy."

[294] William F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religions of Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1956), 165-66.

Canaanite feast influence,[295] Vawter and Hoppe instead consider the Egyptian connection of the theomorphic deities of the pantheon. They argue that this seat is related to the altars in the temple precincts, including an image of Asherah the queen of heaven on the altar, as the book of Kings and Jeremiah depicted respectively. These conjectures see the image as erected by Israelites due to their voluntary desire to imitate surrounding religious practices. Approaching from the historical setting of the text, Sweeney proposes to see some foreign force in the image of jealousy. He argues that this image of jealousy would be Nebuchadnezzar's victory stele, erected on the site of the defeated city Jerusalem, specifically in the temple courtyard to show Nebuchadnezzar's ruling power to every citizen.[296] This is very probable in consideration of the historical setting, but when we take the logic of the text in the literary setting, some questions come up. According to Ezekiel 8:5-6, a jealous image and abominable deeds of the religious personnel provoked YHWH's wrath and made him abandon his temple and the city. The invasion of the Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar, implicitly presented in chapter 9 as a tool under the leadership of the heavenly executioners, is one of the divine punishments for an action done by Israelites at a certain point in their history. Thus, the stele by Nebuchadnezzar as a possible answer is the result of the divine punishment rather than the cause to provoke YHWH's jealousy. This logic of the literary presentation in Ezekiel 8-9 leads us to seek a different source for this mysterious jealous image than Nebuchadnezzar's stele.

---

[295] Theodore H. Gaster, "Ezekiel and the Mysteries," *JBL* 60 (1941): 289-310.

[296] Sweeney, *Reading Ezekiel*, 56.

Recently, Stephen Cook has presented a possible identity of the corpses of kings in

Ezekiel 43:7-9. Based on several ANE comparisons, including the pagrāʾum, "death-offering" in

ancient Mari, and "pagrū," a stela from the Dagan Temple site at Ugarit, and the textual

comparison with Leviticus 10 and 26, Cook sees the rebuke of the corpse-related tradition in

Ezekiel 43:7-9 as the Judean kings' profanity of God's name by erecting "pagrū" fixtures as their

cenotaphs.[297] Now, I would like to connect this funerary monument with the seat of the jealous

image in our text. Historically, the Judean kings were interred in the tombs of City of David and

in the garden of Uzza, near the temple. From the perspective of the implied Zadokite author,

these "pagrū" rites and fixtures must be regarded as a radical threat to the presence of YHWH. In

priestly worldview, death is the antithesis of sanctity and the placement of a corpse or

installations related to death would run completely counter to priestly thought and practice. Not

only the location of the images but also the pattern of logic shows us similarities and makes us

connect the two things. Moreover, if we admit that Ezekiel 40-48 is an ambitious, rectifying

agenda of the failing history of Israel including what the first temple vision displayed, the

funerary monument suggestion would be persuasive.

[Narrator's Introduction versus Character's recognition (8:3b; 8:5b)]

Now, let us pay attention to the different presentations of 8:3b and of 8:5b though both

verses mention the same jealous image. We read 8:3b: "… to Jerusalem, to the entrance of the

---

[297] Stephen Cook, "The Shocking Severance from Sheol of Ezekiel's Utopia" (paper presented at the annual meeting for the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, Georgia, November, 2015).

north gate of the inner court, where the seat of the idol of jealousy, which provokes to jealousy, was located." Who perceives this? Ben Adam the character? Or, Ben Adam the narrator? As we have studied, while the former is the experiencing agent, the latter is the telling agent who describes what the character Ben Adam has experienced. Indeed, in my reading, this is the clear example of the narrator's focalization. Here in verse 8:3b the information about the place is not yet given to the character Ben Adam. Contrastingly, Ben Adam the narrator appears to know already, and probably the narrator expects that his narratee, the elders of Judah in Babylon, already knew this fact from their memory of Jerusalem. This is not new for either the narrator or the narratee. Accordingly, it functions as the confirmation that Ben Adam arrived at the "correct" spot; it suggests that Jerusalem—while the captives went into exile—has not changed. The first and the foremost impression of Jerusalem and the alluded Jerusalem temple (by the word "inner-court") is the space of the seat of the jealous image.

Now, a more serious statement has been revealed to the reader, and the author now allows Ben Adam the character to shout about this shocking moment. The YHWH who disappeared has reappeared in the form of the glory of YHWH in verse 4 at the same spot as the seat of the jealous image.[298] We read 8:5b: "So I lifted up my eyes toward the north, and behold, north of the altar gate, in the entrance, was this image of jealousy." The text reserves this image

---

[298] For the discussion about "glory of the God of Israel," see Elizabeth Keck, "The Glory of Yahweh, Name Theology, and Ezekiel's Understanding of Divine Presence (Ph.D. diss, Boston College, 2011). This scene shows a close connection of the book of Ezekiel to the priestly writings.

to Ben Adam the character until he obeys the divine command to lift his eyes and face the image with his eyes. Readers may notice that the author often gives the typical surprising expression וראה והנה "and I saw and behold!" to the mouth of the character to attribute certain experiences to the character's perception rather than the narrator's. Thus, the case of 8:3b belongs to the narrator's perception while the case of 8:5b shows the character's perception.

Who stands with Ben Adam at this very shocking spot? This same spot provokes great anxiety and uneasiness for the priest Ben Adam the character—therefore it provokes anxiety and uneasiness for readers, too. For the intelligent readers, the following logic seems natural: YHWH is a God of Jealousy, and the seat of the jealous image and the holy deity cannot coexist in the same spot. Soon, there would be the inevitable collision.

Unlike the reader's expectation of the immediate collision, the vision account delays the disaster until chapter 9 by inserting several events and descriptions in between the two divine glory scenes (from 8:4 to 9:3). The first delaying topic is a description about God's glory, in which the author lets the character Ben Adam bring forth his own visionary experience in the valley in ch. 3. This recall strategy is repeated in the final vision in 43:3.

As another delaying method, 8:5 introduces the divine command in his speech to Ben Adam. This divine command does not end as one-time command but makes YHWH act as the tour guide and the educator. This time-consuming education works very effectively by attributing the source of the "reality" of Jerusalem and its temple to the authoritative YHWH's presentation. Here, the narrator's perception and the notification to the reader regarding the

140

image of jealousy are now obviously transmitted to the character Ben Adam by the command-obedience form of character-character interaction (YHWH and Ben Adam). So, although we do not know the exact spot where Ben Adam arrived, it is natural to conclude that the place and the image in verse 4 and verse 5 are identical. Using the gradation device, the implied author reveals more and more concrete information to his readers. Based on the narrator's focalization, readers come to know that the image of jealousy in verse 4 can be seen at the entrance of the gateway of the inner court that faces north. In verse 5, readers now get more information that the gate is nearby or is related to the altar. In other words, the text provokes readers to remember any text or memory which shows the altar, the jealous image, and the temple all together in a very close place. I will reserve the intertextual analysis for the later discussion. But now, we have come to know that the expression "north of the altar gate" should be understood as the same gateway in verse 4 which is nearby the altar, or the spot from which Ben Adam can see both the gate and the altar. As usual, the author uses the acclamation adverb "behold" to emphasize the surprising discovery made by Ben Adam the character here in verse 5, as the narrator did in verse 4.

This "showing" method before the "telling" version, which was also used in chapters 5-7, is a very powerful tool for persuasion and here it works even in the vision frame. So far, within three verses, the word "jealousy" appears three times and tells us that this is the issue of the vision. Regarding the semantic aura of the word "jealousy" (הַקִּנְאָה), we readers may be naturally reminded of the phrase "the God of Israel is a jealous God" in Exodus and Deuteronomy, especially the texts which are related to the covenantal relationship between YHWH and his

141

people.[299] Especially, the very two key words, "jealousy" and "abomination" (תּוֹעֵבוֹת)[300] in this

unit are connected to Deuteronomy 32:16, "They made him jealous with strange; with

abominations they provoked him to anger (יַקְנִאֻהוּ בְּזָרִים בְּתוֹעֵבֹת יַכְעִיסֻהוּ)." This connection makes

us think about the underlying theology or agenda of Ezekiel 8-11 when the narrator condemns

the phenomena in the Jerusalem temple as the great abominations.

A semantic context of 8:6 tells that the ambiguous syntactic situation of the infinitive

construct לרחקה in 8:6 bα should be translated as resultive rather than the purposive.[301] Based

on "the plain sense of רחק in the G-stem is intransitive, William Strong challenges the

traditional interpretation of this infinitive, which YHWH makes distant from his sanctuary and

argues that people left the sanctuary.[302] But, this alternative reading seems not much convincing

to me in terms of semantic understandings of the text. Both the overall characterization of

YHWH and the abominable scenes in the temple in Ezekiel 8-11, for example, show different

pictures from Strong's argument.

From the questions and answers of YHWH in 8:6, we can tell that YHWH plays the role

of the explicit interlocutor as well as the educator while Ben Adam the character plays the role of

the implicit interlocutor as a delegator of the elders of Judah who were sitting in the prophet's

---

[299] Some of references include Exod. 20:5; 34:14; Deut. 4:24; 5:9; 6:15; 32:16; 32:21.

[300] תּוֹעֵבֹת "abominations" as Jerusalem's sins occur in Ezek. 5:9; 7:3, 4, 8, 9; 9:4; 12:16; 16:2, 47, 50; 18:13, 24; 20:4; 22:2; 23:36; 33:26, 29; 36:31. Cf., Rom-Shiloni, "Jerusalem and Israel, Synonyms or Antonyms?," 91.

[301] Cf. Wilhelm Gesenius, Emil Friedrich Kautzsch, and A. E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar,* 2nd English rev. edition in accordance with the 28th German edition (1909) (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910), 331.

[302] Strong, "The God that Ezekiel Inherited," 41-42. See also Ka Leung Wong, "A Note on Ezekiel VIII 6," *VT* 51 (2001): 396-400; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 218, 240.

house in 8:1. Besides this, we need to pay attention to multiple roles of YHWH and the relevant expressions, such as "hand of YHWH," "the spirit of YHWH," "the God of Israel," and "the glory of YHWH/the God of Israel." For example, in 8:4, the glory plays the role of the guide, but later in chapters 9 and 10, the glory appears as the manifestation of the ultimate judge whose wrath falls upon his own temple and city.

4.1.1.1.2 Settings

[Historical and Literary Setting; Memory and Agenda]

Based on the structural analysis in the former section, we may now trace possible historical setting(s) which might work as a model in the memory of the implied author. This is a different approach from a typical search for historical settings, which usually seek the probable settings from the later dates with the conviction of possible reflections. Rather, my trajectory work pursues the historical settings of its mother text and the historical situations of the author Ezekiel 8-11.

First, probable resources of the implied author's memory would come from some reflections of Ahaz's altar in 2 Kings 16:9-18. There are two points to which we need to pay attention regarding the intertextual reading. The first point is Ahaz's large altar which provokes YHWH's anger according to the Kings' narrative. Imitating the style of Damascus, either from Assyria or from Aram, King Ahaz had priest Uriah make this large altar while he stayed in Damascus. This can be also read as King Ahaz played as a foil to both Moses, who delivered the tabernacle instruction to the personnel, and King David, who handed down the temple instruction to his son Solomon. Interestingly, this reversal of Ahaz's effort to imitate the temple style from

the surrounding nations is rectified by Ezekiel Ben Adam who viewed the built temple in order to deliver the instruction to the priest and to the building personnel. Thus, if Moses, David, and Ezekiel can stand in a row in terms of the deliverer of the heavenly temple structure, King Ahaz stands in the opposite as the one who disturbed the heavenly order. Unfortunately, what Ben Adam saw in the first temple vision in Ezekiel 8 might be the remnant of King Ahaz's

abomination, the Ahaz altar. The text of 2 Kings 16:15 tells us this new altar is bigger than the old bronze altar and was used by the king for his special purpose. This text shows a clear example of how kings have made the temple corrupt.

The second point would be the location of this new altar. King Ahaz commanded the temple structure to be rearranged (2 Kings 16:14), which is severely criticized by the author of Ezekiel 43. From this sharp criticism about the altar and other elements of temple structure and from the first topic of the altar from 43:12, we can conjecture that the implied author must be very concerned about the remodeling of the old temple structure. According to 2 Kings 16:14, "And the bronze altar that was before the LORD he removed from the front of the house, from the place between his altar and the house of the LORD, and put it on the north side of his altar" (ESV), the Ahaz altar is located to the south of the old bronze altar, which made it possible that the passersby to the south of the temple in a lower position can see Ahaz's altar better than any other elements of the temple. I am not talking about "historical" presentations but the literary presentations with the presupposition that portions of Kings would be known to the Ezekiel community.

The third insight is to see this abominable reality in vision as the preview of the city and the temple in Ezekiel 40-48. In 40:2, Ezekiel was brought to the temple precinct and saw the structure toward city, which was later revealed as YHWH Shammah. In 43:7, Ben Adam

144

experienced the glory of the God of Israel coming back. According to the memory of the implied

author, the temple in Jerusalem in Ezekiel 8-11 still has the abominable Ahaz altar which

provokes the anger of God and made him depart from the sanctuary. According to the

expectation of the implied author in the final temple vision, the new temple stood by being

remodeled, and with the altar replacement it was made possible for YHWH to come back to his

own house. Ahaz's altar is one of the first images and impressions of the city and the temple,

which drives YHWH from his sanctuary. This jealousy provoking image functions as the overall

theme of the temple tour in this whole unit, and here the attitude of the narrator has been

changed. So far, the narrator Ben Adam keeps a descriptive tone but when he begins to talk

about "Jerusalem"/"the Temple," the important subject of this vision, the narrator becomes very

impatient and changes his mood to a more critical manner.

4.1.1.1.3 Genres and Languages

The discussion in Settings makes us pay more attention to its genre. We can now more

easily understand the apparently incomprehensible language and vague expressions. We should

not forget that all the sentences expressed here occurred in the vision. Also, we need to observe

more carefully what kind of grammar rules the author of this text kept and what kind of grammar

rules he violated. For example, gender and number agreements between subject and verb were

often ignored in the Ezekiel 1 vision, but not here. Most cases, the text of Ezekiel 8-11 keeps the

rule of the first person limited point of view (homodiegetic narrative and focalization), and I will

deal later with the case of its violation in chapter 9. Regarding the itinerary, the text enjoys

freedom of the vision. Indeed, the book of Ezekiel already showed this simultaneous here and

there language in the Ezekiel 1 vision. If the first vision had its readers experience discrepancy of

subject pronouns and verbs in terms of gender and number, here we experience the discrepancy

of the spatial and chronological order, i.e., it is not the chronological order of the spatial

presentation but the simultaneous presentation without any notice to the reader.

4.1.1.2 Second "He Brought Me"   (8:7-13)

Second "He brought me"	8:7-13
a. Narrator's report of the movement: to the entrance of the court	8:7a
b. [Character's first perception] of a hole in the wall	8:7b
c. First Divine command to dig through the wall	8:8a
① Speech formula	8:8aα
② Speech per se	8:8aβ
d. Ben Adam's obedience	8:8bα
e. [Character's second perception] of a hidden entrance	8:8bβ
f. Second Divine command to enter in and to see	8:9
① Speech formula	8:9a
② Speech per se	8:9b
g. Ben Adam's obedience	8:10aα
h. [Character's third perceptions]	8:10aβ-8:11
① of abominable decorations on the wall[303]	8:10 aβ-10b
② of the people: character's focalization	8:11
a) Seventy men of elders and "Jaazaniah son of Saphan"	8:11aα
b) their deeds: smoking the censer	8:11aβ
c) description of the ascending smoke[304]	8:11b
i. Divine Education #2 based on Ben Adam's experience	8:12-13
① First divine speech: Interpretation	8:12
a) Speech formula	8:12aα
b) Speech per se	8:12aβ-8:12b
i. Rhetorical question to get agreement from Ben Adam	8:12aβ-aγ
ii. Indirect condemnation by quoting the elders' saying[305]	8:12b

---

[303] Pay attention to the adjective "every" and "all". The implied author of the text now makes the Jerusalem Temple a dystopia. All the abominable things are collected here to be ready for the punishment!

[304] Now, the full description in fact ends up and the readers can perceive what the character perceived.

[305] If the description functions as deeds and then the quotation works as their sayings. So here, "because" is the reason of why YHWH argues they are abominable to his eyes. Thus, here, "כי" is better to be understood as "in addition to" their abominable doing. Accordingly, this

1. Quotation formula   8:12bα[1]
2. Quotation per se: 8:12bα[2]-bβ
     a. YHWH does not see us   8:12bα[2]
     b. YHWH forsook the land[306]   8:12bβ
② Second divine speech: leading to the next movement to see
     "greater" abominations   8:13
     a) Speech formula   8:13a
     b) Speech per se   8:13b

4.1.1.2.1 Structure

As the title of this sub unit tells, this is the second "he brought me" section, which covers

8:7-13. Unlike the case of 8:3b, the first "it brought me" with "the Spirit lifted me up," 8:7a is free

from the agreement duty of subject-verb (3rd person feminine singular noun "the Spirit") and

comes back to a masculine pronoun "he" in expression of YHWH. This unit begins with the

narrator's report of the movement after the last mention of YHWH for the next movement in 8:6.

The Ben Adam narrator reports that he arrived at the entrance of the court. Although the formal

structure shows some markers using the transporting verb "come/go," indeed the actual

movement seems not so important; rather it is depicted as the series of scenes are appearing and

disappearing or rising and sinking. In fact, this kind of separation or the feeling of separation

makes the reader/interpreter treat the character Ben Adam as distinct from the narrator Ben

---

rhetorical question plays as a bridge to connect the perception of Ben Adam as elders' deeds and
the following quotation of their saying, another basis of the condemnation.

[306] It can be interpreted in several ways: complaining, mourning, and possible conspiracy.
In YHWH's perspective, it also can be the basis of his judgment: "I will do according as what
they say."

Adam. I encourage my readers to imagine that Ben Adam the narrator is sitting with the audience/reader in front of the stage while Ben Adam the character is acting with the invisible character YHWH on the stage.

Once the movement report is done, the narrator, as if we click the play button of the video player to show the performance during our presentation, allows the character's perceptions from 8:7b to the end of this unit. I recognize three different perceptions of character Ben Adam; interestingly, YHWH is the agent who makes all three perceptions of Ben Adam the character possible. The first perception, the discovery of the hole in the wall (8:7b), is caused by YHWH bringing Ben Adam to the entrance. This revelation is the result of YHWH's leading and also functions as the source of the next plot movement. Now, in 8:8a-8:9aβ, YHWH commands Ben Adam the character to dig through the wall and Ben Adam obeys the command. As mentioned previously, this obedience opens the second perception stage as Ben Adam discovers a hidden entrance. The repeated command-obedience form functions to show that the divine command becomes the reality through the execution of actions by YHWH's servant, Ben Adam. This is the perception of the acting character Ben Adam, rather than the telling narrator Ben Adam. The difference lies in the present reality in this journey.

The second divine command is presented in 8:9 with direct speech. By using "here" the text emphasizes on one hand that YHWH and Ben Adam are together in their existence in the abominable place; on the other hand, however, it also avoids the proper name YHWH so as to not offend its reader's theological concept. Ben Adam the character (Ben Adam on the stage or in the screen in the contemporary term) obeys again and makes the third perception possible in

8:10-11. When Ben Adam digs through the wall, the new scenery reveals the abominable decorations on the wall and people in that room. This third and last perception of this unit is shocking enough and allows YHWH's accusations and defends his abandonment of his sanctuary and city. We need to pay attention here to the adjective כֹּל "every" or "all." The implied author of the text now makes the Jerusalem Temple a dystopia. All the abominable things are collected here to be prepared for the punishment. As I titled in the structure above, discovery and mention of the people are the character's focalization.

Strong markers lead readers to connect this scene with the Exodus and Numbers text. For example, the term "seventy elders" as the representative of the children of Israel in Exodus 24 and in Numbers 11 appear in the context of the divine command to come up to YHWH in all three texts. In both cases, the elders are depicted as the beneficiaries of the extended special divine revelation on one hand but the end of that special treatment shows frustrating results on the other hand. Now, the description of the people and their deeds in Ezekiel 8 are enough to provoke the readers to also remember the tragic incident in the book of Numbers. Special attention also goes to the "elders of the house of Israel." Moreover, the family of Jaazaniah, as the family of Shaphan who supported Jeremiah and King Josiah, surprisingly becomes an object of condemnation.[307] "Censer" is also overlapped with the vocabulary of Numbers 16-18, although the agent of the Numbers episode was the chiefs or princes, not the elders.

---

[307] Sweeney, "Ezekiel's Debate with Isaiah," 185-202.

If this worship scene was abominable in the eyes of Ezekiel, as Sweeney argues, due to the ritual performed by inappropriate personnel, i.e., not the Zadokite priests,[308] we may conjecture that the author of this text might share the evaluation of the book of Kings' perspective on the Josiah's reform. Although it is presented in a very subtle way, 2 Kings clearly shows that the roles of King Josiah, scribe Shaphan, and prophetess Huldah—none of whom were Zadokite priests—were much more significant than the role of high priest Hilkiah. The cause of the aborted Josiah's reform might then be found ironically in the ritualistic boundary crossing.

With the seventy men of elders, a specific person name, and the description of the ascending smoke, the audience/readers can fully perceive what the character Ben Adam perceived. Once the abominable scene is revealed to readers and audience (not only to the character Ben Adam), YHWH begins to educate. The education consists of two parts as usual. In the previous unit, YHWH says this jealousy provoking image drove him out from his sanctuary. Now he seeks the agreement of Ben Adam as well as the implied audience by using rhetorical questions.

We need to imagine the invisible thick wall between the offender and the defender, even if it the scene has the disputable form. There are no interactions between YHWH and the idol worshippers, nor between YHWH and the people of Israel. This issue can be addressed with the relationship between words and deeds. In this vision, deeds of the accused elders are taken by the supernatural way of the Spirit and it is presented via vision, but their words/sayings are taken by

---

[308] Sweeney, *Reading Ezekiel,* 57.

YHWH and are only presented within the quoted speech. In other words, not only quoted speech but also their deeds are completely controlled by the implied author and were provided as to the homodiegetic narrator to narratee.

In 8:12, the description functions as deeds and then the quotation works as their sayings. So here, "because" is the reason of why YHWH argues that the elders are abominable to his eyes. Thus, "כי" in 8:12 is better to understand as 'in addition to' their abominable doing. Accordingly, this rhetorical question plays as a bridge to connect Ben Adam's perception of the elders' deeds and the following quotation of their sayings which will function as another basis of YHWH's condemnation.

Another important point is that, in this process of accusation, YHWH needs the mediator. It is similar to the situation that YHWH never interacts directly with Pharaoh in Exodus, but always through the mediator Moses; in the subsequent prophetic and priestly writings, YHWH rarely converses with the people or the sinners who should be punished. It may reflect the fact that everything happened in Ezekiel's vision, mind, and thought, not in the actual world.

Zimmerli argues that the first person narrative in the book of Ezekiel reflects Ezekiel as a not-so-strong character, with YHWH as the stronger character.[309] In my reading, I think it would be rather the reflection of the author's consciousness/the boundary line which makes the narrator stop asserting that the presentation will soon come true.

---

[309] Zimmerli, "Special Form-and Traditio-historical Character of Ezekiel's Prophecy," *VT* 15 (1965): 515-16.

4.1.1.2.2 Genres and Languages

This section shows several distinct sub-genres within the framework of the vision narrative. The first conspicuous genre is a continuing temple tour from the previous unit. The purpose of the tour indicates its didactic intention with questions on one hand and Accusation which will be later used as an indictment of Judgment oracle against Individual (JI).[310] Finally, disputation can also be found through the quoted speech of the elders in 8:12.

4.1.1.2.3 Settings

Possible construction of the historical setting will be discussed in 4.1.1.5 Concluding Divine Speech (8:17-18) as a wrap-up of Ezekiel 8, but here I would like to point one significant historical background in this scene.

Regarding the peculiar action of digging through the wall in 8:8, Sweeney connects the action to the emulation of Nebuchadnezzar's strategy in an attempt to infiltrate to the city of Jerusalem in 598/597 BCE.[311] Although we have no evidence of the connection between the text presentation and the historical reality, in terms of the reader's intertextual reading, Sweeney's study is relevant and worth consideration, even though one question still remains, which is to what degree we need to apply this action to Ben Adam's action. In other words, we ask that in connection of the literary feature to the historical background, to ask the more than one matching element is a legitimate question or not, which Ben Adam plays a Babylonian soldier who dug through the wall in this scene.

---

[310] Cf. Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39*, 512, 529, 541.

[311] Sweeney, *Reading Ezekiel*, 56.

Another feature of the social setting in this scene is that ritualistic offenses are greatly emphasized as the probable reflection of priestly concerns. All these things suggest that we should think the reuse of the earlier traditions in the book of Ezekiel is much broader and more serious than we may initially expect.

4.1.1.3 Third "He Brought Me" (8:14-15)

Third "He brought me"		8:14-15

a. Narrator's report:
     moving to the entrance of the north gate of the temple   8:14a
b. [Character's perception] on the weeping women for Tammuz   8:14b
c. Divine Education #3   8:15
   ① Speech formula   8:15aα
   ② Speech per se   8:15aβ-15b
      a) Rhetorical question to confirm his argument   8:15aβ
      b) Leading to the next move   8:15b

4.1.1.3.1 Structure

Now, in this third move, the process becomes very brief because readers are already familiar with the narrator's style so that without further repetition readers can follow the story line. This scene, therefore, works as preparation for the next stage of declaration of the judgment and execution of action. Thus, even further comment on the mourning ritual for Tammuz is omitted here.

As we see in the structure, 8:14 consists of the narrator's report and the character's perception about the mourning for Tammuz. Although it sounds unnatural to the ears of the traditional narrative analysts, biblical scholars often consult with the narratology in their understanding of the biblical narrative. Adele Berlin with the understanding of the relationship between the film and narrative, is an example who recognizes the potentially multifocal nature of

biblical texts as a product of shifts in point of view. [312] In my structural analysis, this multiplicity

will be applied to the distinct functions of the character Ben Adam and the narrator Ben Adam.

4.1.1.3.2 Settings

In discussion of the setting of the unit, attention has been paid to various possible

historical backgrounds of the Tammuz myth. Tammuz was a prime example of the myth of the

dying-and-rising god of vegetation, whose annual death, in the heat and drought of summer,

signified the decay of nature. Accordingly, major interpretations of this myth and the

presentation of weeping women for him have a tendency to interpret the myth and ritual as a

manipulative rite of sympathetic magic.[313] Zimmerli also points out that women's weeping for

Tammuz reflects the loss of fertility in Sumerian literature.[314] Brandon Frenbug reads this

phenomenon as the forceful influences from the surrounding nations. If there must be an

Egyptian influence as a vassal of Egypt after the death of King Josiah, the Babylonian vassalage

under Jehoiachin and Zedekiah must also be reflected in the Tammuz worship in officially public

places like the temple.[315] If these are the historical background, this ritual presentation in the

context of the first temple vision vividly enhances YHWH's indictment against the temple due to

the Jerusalemites' abominable practices.

---

[312] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*, Bible and Literature Series 9 (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983), 43.

[313] About Tammuz discussion, see Bendt Alster, "Tammuz," in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible,* ed. K. van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter Willem van der Horst, 2nd extensively rev. edition (Leiden; Boston; Grand Rapids: Brill ; Eerdmans, 1999), 828–34.; Mark E. Cohen, *The Cultic Calendars of the Ancient Near East* (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1993), 262, 315.

[314] Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 242–43.

[315] Brandon Frenbug, *Ezekiel*, College Press NIV Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), 90.

4.1.1.4 Fourth "He Brought Me" to the inner court of the temple (8:16)

Fourth "He brought me" to the inner court of the temple	8:16
A. Narrator's report: moving to the inner court of the temple	8:16a
B. [Character's perception] on the twenty-five men of sun worshippers	8:16b

4.1.1.4.1 Structure

In division of the sub-unit, I exclude a confirmative question in 8:17a, "Have you seen this, Ben Adam", since this apparently same question functions differently from the three earlier questions (8:6, 12, 15). If the earlier cases lead the tour to the next stage for further education, the later case (8:17a) leads the reader to the judgment stage from the enlisting of the accusations. Thus, I do not include this question in this sub-unit.

Now, explicit expression of moving characters reveals that the tour has reached the temple inner court, though the holy of holies is neither open nor accessible to the tourist/spectator Ben Adam the character. Although it is not the holy of holies, this movement is very significant since it is the very court and the very sanctuary where the divine judgment will soon be expressed. In other words, this is the last visible education before Ben Adam listens to the judgment against Jerusalem and its temple. With the transitional verses 17-18, now in chapter 9, YHWH will proclaim his verdict. He will call the heavenly hosts to execute his judgment. It is interesting that the holy of holies keeps its sacredness or secrecy; YHWH comes out to the court where his servants and his people may stand. Nobody can intrude where the ark of covenant rests. In my reading, therefore, the coming out of the glory of YHWH with his throne in 9:3 should be understood as the presence of YHWH as the ultimate judge and king to his own city and dwelling place, rather than as a preparation of his departure. The departure is then depicted after the verdict was completed by the executioners.

4.1.1.4.2 Settings

As we shall see in the overall setting of Ezekiel 8, it is hard to deny the allusions of the astral worship introduced by King Ahaz and King Manasseh. A Standard Biblical Dictionary also connects the sun worship ritual in this verse to the Josiah text in 2 Kings 23: 12.[316]

4.1.1.5 Concluding Divine Speech to Ben Adam after the fourfold visual education: Divine education/judgment (8:17-18)

Concluding Divine Speech to Ben Adam after the fourfold visual education:

Divine education #4 and judgment	8:17-18
a. Speech formula	8:17aα
b. Speech per se	8:17aβ-18b
① Accusations	8:17aβ-8:17bα
a) Rhetorical question #1 as the education or appeal	8:17aβ
b) Rhetorical question #2 as the transition to accusation	8:17bα
c) YHWH cannot endure their violence	8:17bβ
② Judgment with "I Also" as the Proper Divine Reaction	8:18a-b
a) How: no spare nor pity	8:18a
b) Not hear their prayer	8:18b

4.1.1.5.1 Structure of Ezekiel 8:17-18

Apparently, this unit seems to belong to the previous unit as the divine comment on the sun worshippers. But, the form and content tell us their differences. First of all, the rhetorical questions and subsequent judgments show the cumulative aspect of the divine judgment. This unit functions as a transition between the fourfold visual temple tour (8:3b-8:16) and the

---

[316] Melancthon W. Jacobus, Edward E. Nourse, and Andrew C. Zenos, eds. *A Standard Bible Dictionary: Designed as a Comprehensive Guide to The Scriptures, Embracing Their Languages, Literature, History, Biography, Manners and Customs, and Their Theology* (New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1909), 790.

judgment announcement (8:18) and immediate execution (ch. 9). Character Ben Adam's role has also been changed from tourist to spectator, until the similar tour resumes in chapter 11.[317]

If we read these two verses, 8:17-18, under the fourth "he brought me" section, we may miss the point of the accusations and judgment. The accusations are not only limited to the sun worshippers in 8:16 but also include all four abominable deeds of the Israelites. Now with this transition, chapter 9 shows how YHWH will execute his actions, based on his proclamations in the last two verses in chapter 8. Thus, this transitional divine speech should be in the same line with "He Brought Me" as the conclusion of all four "Brought Me" sections, and under the very left line of "The Spirit Lifted Me Up" line as we see in my formal structure diagram above.

The stillness of this section is important because, from this block, Ben Adam the character and Ben Adam the narrator are not so distinct since the text does not necessarily take Ben Adam's perception as the focalizing source. From this scene, Ben Adam does not move until the "Second Lift Up" in 11:1. In this still scene, Ben Adam acts more from the perspectives of the audience, whereas in the former scenes of chapter 8, Ben Adam acts as a quasi-YHWH to show the reality of the invisible secrets of the Jerusalem Temple and invisible God's mind. I interpret these double duties as Ben Adam's prophetic-priestly figure or identity. In chapter 8, Ben Adam

---

[317] John Strong expresses this one as "a passive bystander observing a heavenly drama." John T. Strong, "The God Ezekiel Inherited," In *The God Ezekiel Creates,* ed. Paul M. Joyce and Dalit Rom-Shiloni (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, an imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2015), 42.

stands as priest as a mediator between God and people, as a representative of God; in chapter 9 and 11, he kneels down before God as the voice of people as prophet to appeal their concern to YHWH.

We have two questions in this section. The first question, "Have you seen O Ben Adam?" is rather educational by calling Ben Adam to react for the fourth "he brought me" in verse 16. On the contrary, the second question is more rhetorical to quench any potential opposition against the impending proclamation of the divine judgment. By attaching this transitional statement, the illustration and showings up to here now all function as the accusation materials, and the next verse starts as the announcement of judgment. Surely, when the tour goes into the inner place of the house, the degree of the abominations grows deeper and deeper. In terms of the priestly perspective, this is disgusting and not durable even to see at distance, since the degree of the abomination and the degree of holiness are correspondent to the seriousness of the spark of clash between profanity and holiness.[318]

In this disputative discourse, the conversation is not a two-way dialogue. YHWH shows and asks without any expectation of agreement or disagreement. Rather, this rhetoric shows the very authoritative figure of YHWH, so that Ben Adam is brought here as the representative of the audience or a traveler, i.e., this indeterminacy of the addressee invites any reader to identify him/herself as Ben Adam. Likewise, Ben Adam is set in the same framework in which he only responds to his readers (not even his audience) as though he automatically broadcasts to himself and others or even pretends as if he writes this for himself. Thus, the exclamation mark "behold!" is used for the narrator as well as the reader. This literary/rhetorical device plays a

---

[318] Richard D. Nelson, *Raising up a faithful priest: Community and Priesthood in Biblical Theology* (Louisville: Westminster/ John Knox, 1993), 17-39.

significant role in the book of Ezekiel without any filtering framework. The last "behold" in this

accusation is picked up by the speaker YHWH in the illustration of the last abominable rite.

As we see in verse 18, the divine determination is now absolute and firm. Indeed, there is

no room for Ben Adam as a mortal to appeal to God to reverse or withhold the judgment. This

relentless and immediate judgment is a typical tendency in the books of Ezekiel and Jeremiah,

which deal with the impending disaster of the nation. On the contrary, the restoration vision is

presented in very vague temporal remarks. Thomas M. Raitt points out that the sentence "my eye

will show no pity, and I will not relent" (8:18; 9:5; and 9:10) belongs to the typical Ezekielian

use of the Deuteronomistic formula, also found in 5:11; 7:4, 9; 16:5, and in 20:17; 36:21 (more

as allusions).[319] It suggests the intertextual relationship between DtrH and this text.

Overall Ezekiel 8 is the announcement of Judgment against the nation in the vision

narrative frame.[320] The execution then immediately follows. Detailed illustrations are: 8:3b-8:17

as the content of the accusations; 8:18 as judgment; 9:1-11 as the first execution (execution 1):

defilement of the temple and smiting the city dwellers; 10:1-22 as departure of the glory of God

as another execution (execution 2). Chapter 11 functions as the hope for the exiles because it is

the judgment announcement to Jerusalem's inhabitants. The ensuing deliverance announcement

should be understood this way.[321] In fact, 11:1-21 is the inner sandwich, inserted in between

10:20-22 and 11:22-23. The journey of the glory of YHWH was suspended by the disputative

narrative in chapter 11 and resumes at the end of chapter 11.

---

[319] Thomas M. Raitt, *A Theology of Exile: Judgment/Deliverance in Jeremiah and Ezekiel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 51-55.

[320] Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39*, 513-14.

[321] Rom-Shiloni, *Exclusive Inclusivity*. 185-95.

4.1.1.6 Further Study: Ahaz and Manasseh Win Over: Memory, Vision, and

Heterotopia, the Case of Ezekiel 8

4.1.1.6.1 Problems:

When we read the descriptions of the new temple vision in Ezekiel 40-48, readers may

automatically think of the structure of Solomon's temple. When we read the vision account

against the Jerusalem temple in Ezekiel 8-11, we also look at the first temple of the sixth century

B.C.E. in an attempt to match the known structure of Solomon's Temple with the structure which

Ezekiel claims he saw. But we may soon find ourselves frustrated. First of all, as we have seen,

the journey by the Spirit to Jerusalem starts with ambiguity. Although the text tells us that the

first person speaker Ben Adam arrives in the city Jerusalem, his initial station is presented

ambiguously and confuses readers. This is ambiguous because the text does not provide any

specific name of a gate, hall, or room. The information given to us is too short to reconstruct Ben

Adam's departing point and itinerary through the temple and Jerusalem. This presentation is also

somewhat confusing because, for example, the phrase "the entrance of the gate of inner-court

which faces the north" in 8:3 makes many interpreters conjecture it as the gate of the temple

inner-court since the nuance of "inner-court" and "Jerusalem" is less matching than with "the

temple." Even if we imagine the possibility of "inner-court" as some gate to the enclosed inner-

court of the palace, thinking of the case in Esther 5:11, the fact that all usages of "inner-court" in

the book of Ezekiel indicate the temple inner-court makes that conjecture unlikely.

160

The difficult experience in mapping this tour at the first station is just the beginning.

Another frustration comes from the uncertainty of the supposed model in seeking the parallels.

What kind of temple/temple structure did Ben Adam see in the vision? Let me modify the

question. Is it legitimate to assume that the temple structure and its facilities have been kept from

the time of King Solomon in 1 Kings 8 (a presumably modeled literary representation) until the

time of Zedekiah in 2 Kings 25 (a contemporary time of the literary background of the book of

Ezekiel)? Although we do not know which era of the temple Ben Adam saw, we do know

through the book of Kings that the first temple in Jerusalem experienced substantial changes

throughout the monarchic period, including the times of King Ahaz and Manasseh. This suggests

that the target model of the Jerusalem temple which appeared in Ezekiel's vision might be more

than one. Accordingly, readers indeed encounter two kinds of uncertainty, both with the temple

structure in Ben Adam's vision in Ezekiel 8 and with Solomon's temple structure in Kings. In

sum, drawing a map according to the description of Ezekiel 8 and according to the map of Kings

is not recommendable for understanding the first temple vision in Ezekiel 8. With the practical

impossibility of the change in the late seventh and early sixth century B.C.E., Sweeney also

argues that the abominable imageries on the temple wall would be the reflection of Ezekiel's

memory and frustration rather than the reflection of the renovated temple walls.[322] Those who

inscribe their traditions in their memory can entertain this notion.

Despite this fact, review of the interpretation on Ezekiel 8-11 shows a somewhat

surprising result. Ezekiel scholarship in the early 20th century had a tendency to take the biblical

presentation as a straightforward reflection of reality and applied those in a very realistic manner.

---

[322] Sweeney, *Reading Ezekiel*, 57.

161

Accordingly, the location of the prophecy, either Babylon or Jerusalem, became a matter for the discussion. In other words, as we have studied, several scholars have even used vivid descriptions of the Jerusalem temple in Ezekiel 8-11 as the proof text to argue that Ezekiel never left Jerusalem during his lifetime.[323] Other scholars have spent their efforts in pinpointing Ezekiel's itinerary based on the Solomon Temple.[324] Nonetheless, this haste and automatic return to the mechanical interpretation has hindered the serious consideration of the genre of Ezekiel 8-11, and the ignorance of the genre has blocked interpreters from the broader appreciation of the text with other possibilities.

4.1.1.6.2 New Directions

These two kinds of frustration—ambiguity and confusion, however, lead us to consider a different direction to reach the intentions of the text. This new direction comes from the several observations on intertextual reading of the book of 2 Kings and the book of Ezekiel.

In addition to the form critical analysis for the close reading of the text, three methodologies will be effective: 1) theory of collective and cultural memory; 2) various aspects of intertextual readings including "allusion" and "echo"[325]; and 3) spatial theory on heterotopia and dystopia.

First, let us pay attention to the matter of memory in an attempt to answer what kind of scenery through the history of Israel and Judah would most closely ressemble the presentation with the scene of this Ezekiel vision.

---

[323] See 1.3, History of Interpretation on Ezekiel 8-11 and footnote #7.

[324] For example, Gross, "Ezekiel and Solomon's Temple."

[325] See the above discussions on 2.3. Intertextual Readings and Writings.

162

Before jumping to the intertextual reading between Ezekiel 8 and some relevant biblical texts, we need to consider the advice of this field. Ben Zvi and Diana Edelman urge their readers to admit that nobody can know "the exact sequence of events from the distant past of members of the religious community of Israel in any time period." With this common ground, they also discourage the interpreters from comparing "the version of events encoded in the biblical texts with the potential reality" since the process of actual events, through memories, and the changes according to various factors including individual and social imagination are too much complicated to unpack.[326] The first part of their advice is reasonable and I agree. However, the second piece of advice, that we should not compare the two texts or the text between assumed social settings, needs more contemplation. I would accept their advice as the reality of our field gives us good news as well as bad news. The bad news is that the more we would like to search for the original versions and discover the precise social settings in the present text, the more we will become frustrated. This statement shows the near impossibility of any confident diachronic reconstruction. There is good news, however, that I can take: the present text may show us much looser connections than we interpreters expect even though the author(s) of the text "really" read the mother text and used it in composition. In other words, some of my "readerial" intertextual reading, in which I reserve my position due to the insecure connections between the influencing and influenced texts, may reflect actual intertextual reading and writing in the ancient times. The present study indeed follows Ben Zvi and Edelman's advice by setting the two invisible filters between the two comparing texts: social memory and social expectation/imagination. More precisely, those two kinds of filters are not separated in my reading, but had previously been set up when the middle authors (MA)—from the original author group to the final redactor group—

---

326 Edelman and Ben Zvi, introduction to *Remembering Biblical Figures*, xix.

touched the earlier text and produced the later text. I as an interpreter should recognize with the maximum awareness in my interpretation.

Now, admitting that my consultation cannot go beyond the literary presentation of the Bible, I would argue that the two accounts of King Ahaz and King Manasseh in 2 Kings are the strongest candidates, as I briefly argued in the earlier section[327] This comparison is not only from the common key words between the mother text and the later text, but also from the observations of allusions in Kings' text, as we may imagine that the author of Ezekiel 8 might create his world from the old materials. In my intertextual classification, here we see the creative and dynamic transformation of the author of the book of Ezekiel as "the Reader of the Earlier Text" (RET) and "the Author of the Later Text" (ALT). The possible transformative relationship between the women's room for weaving hangings for the Asherah within the house of God in 2 Kings 23:7 and the women's room for mourning for Tammuz in Ezekiel 8 would be one example. In sum, the memory of 2 Kings and memory of Ezekiel 8-11 are not irrelevant. The book of 2 Kings blames the failed "history" of ancient Judah on the deeds of Manasseh, i.e., no matter how the historical presentation unpacks the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah respectively, the memory or the ultimate evaluation of the narrator shows that the gloomy shadow of Ahaz and Manasseh win over the shiny light of Hezekiah and Josiah.

---

[327] Indeed, Greenberg also mentions about Manasseh's "sculptured image of Asherah" in 2 Kings 21:7 as a possible identity of that jealous image. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 168.

The descriptions of the temple in Ezekiel 8 show the frustration of history more clearly.

In reading Ezekiel 8 with our own memory of 2 Kings, we may ask: how are Hezekiah's and

Josiah's reforms, depicted in 2 Kings, all erased in Ben Adam's vision, i.e., the memory of the

author of Ezekiel 8? If these presentations were in fact based on the collective memory of the

Ezekiel community, the claim of Ben Adam in his vision in fact has several important

implications. First, as many have noticed, this vision scene reveals the secret revelation of the

Jerusalem temple and gives the basis of YHWH's departure from his temple as well as his

abandonment of his people and land. Second, this claim also gives the rationale for the

Babylonian captives to maintain a privileged position compared to the remnant left in Jerusalem.

Third, this vision also lays the foundation of what should be corrected in the restoration vision in

Ezekiel 40-48.

What is the significance, then, that the memory of Ezekiel 8 apparently stopped at the

scenes of King Ahaz and King Manasseh? Placing blame on the relatively remote historical

figures in 2 Kings would work as consolation to Jerusalem and Judah inhabitants, in the sense

that they can avoid the guilt of responsibility for the wrath of YHWH, and they can complain

about theodicy.

For the author of the book of Ezekiel, the meaning goes further because Ezekiel's reform

starts from where Josiah's reform ceased. First, the reformer and the reforming objects are also

radically changed in Ezekiel's hand. If the reformer in Josiah's time was King Josiah and the

earthly priests as the king's retainers, now in Ezekiel's time (and his theology), the ultimate judge

165

and his executioners should be the king of universe YHWH and his heavenly priests. Second, the objects of defilement task starts from the Jerusalem temple itself and goes on to the Jerusalemites. In the Josiah's reform, all kinds of abominable things were eliminated in the Jerusalem temple and other places were defiled. But in the Ezekiel's vision, the Jerusalem temple itself becomes a very abominable object in the eyes of YHWH and should be first defiled by the corpses, and the glory of YHWH should depart. Third, in Josiah's time, several people who were pointed out were slaughtered, but most people survived. In comparison, in the Ezekiel vision, relatively small populations who mourn and got the ת mark on their forehead would survive, and all other people were killed. The text does not tell that the Linen Man could find the qualified people for survival. Finally, contrastive roles of Shaphan and the Shaphan family in both texts draw our attention. In 2 Kings 22 and 25, Shaphan the scribe was one of the key figures from the discovery of the scroll to the completion of Josiah's reform as well as the ancestor of the appointed governor of Jerusalem in the exilic time. In the book of Jeremiah 26-39, this family also plays a positive role in supporting the prophet Jeremiah. But in Ezekiel 8:11, the fame of the same Shaphan family was seriously hurt by being named as one of the abominable worshippers at the temple.

What drove the author of this text to show the genealogy of Jaazaniah as the son of Shaphan? Beyond the polemical aspect of the text, we need to think more on the theology of the book of Ezekiel at this point. In pondering King Josiah's reform, Ezekiel might reach the conclusion that the reason for the shortcoming of the great king's reform lies in the failure of the presence of the right personnel in each reformation. As we previously noted, the active agent of

this reform was a king, not a priest with the Levites. We readers see the shadow of King

Solomon (1 Kings 8), as well as Moses' figure (Exodus 19, 24), when King Josiah renewed (or

just established)[328] a covenant between YHWH and people (2 Kings 23). We readers also see

the shadow of even King Jeroboam, son of Nebat, when King Josiah becomes the chief

commander of the defilement and destruction of what King Jeroboam did long ago. If this is our

reading, what might be the author of the book of Ezekiel's reading? It is clear that the book of

Kings did not go to this further distinction, i.e., the theology of the book of Kings does not seem

to blame any king if he destroyed the abominable idols and eliminated polluted priests,

regardless of that king's limitation on the sacred priestly duties. Nonetheless, the author of the

book of Ezekiel reads the underlying concept of this phenomenon more critically. In front of the

painful question, why YHWH did not turn his wrath on Jerusalem even if King Josiah reformed

according to the instruction of Torah, Ezekiel now answers by showing his visions. In his

conclusion, kingship throughout Israel's history worked as a threatening power to YHWH's

priestly kingdom. Even in the case of "righteous" king Josiah, this indiscrimination in

approaching the holy God caused irreparable disaster.

　　With this diagnosis, Ezekiel now stands up as the second (new) Josiah. Ezekiel 8-11 then

can be read as another version of Josiah's reform. The book of Ezekiel is not satisfied with the

one step and one time reformation; Jerusalem has been too corrupted to be purified that way.

Ezekiel shows three phases for the restoration/recreation: Ezekiel 8-11 is part 1 of the new

reform as the destruction and defilement; Ezekiel 38-39 is part 2 as the purification; and Ezekiel

40-48, part 3, as the new construction. In memory, for the motivation of the composition, Ahaz

---

[328] The Hebrew verb in 2 Kgs 23:4 rather indicates כרת (to make a covenant), not to renew.

and Manasseh win over the great kings, Hezekiah and Josiah; but with the vision framework, the

text anticipates that YHWH will do his will through his servant Ben Adam, the exiled

priest/prophet who functions like Moses. The expiration date of *status quo*, the reformation in the

monarchy, has been passed; the total recreation is necessary. Thus, Ezekiel makes Jerusalem a

dystopia in order to make the genuine rebirth possible. Unfortunately, all these agendas were

made in Ezekiel's mind when he attempted to make his Babylonian exilic place a heterotopia.

Here, the resistant literature aspect of the book of Ezekiel is shining. This heterotopia-making

will be discussed more fully in Part III.

4.1.2 Divine Executions #1 and #2 (9:1-10:22)

4.1.2.1 Divine Execution #1 (9:1-9:11)

4.1.2.1.1 Structure

YHWH as the Ultimate Judge	9:1-9:11

a	Divine command to bring the executioners	9:1
b	Execution commands #1 and #2	9:2-7a
	①. character's description of the scene: the glory of the God of Israel	9:2-3a
	②. Narrating resumed	9:3b-7a
	a) Execution command #1	9:3b-6
	b) Execution command #2	9:7a
c	Omniscient narrator's report of the execution	9:7b
d	Ben Adam character-narrator's appeal to YHWH	9:8
e	YHWH's Apologetics	9:9-10
f	[Character's perception-report] on the complete execution	9:11

Within the first "Spirit Lifted Me Up" section, Ezekiel 9 shows the radical change of the

vision tour to a dramatic narrative. The temple tour in chapter 8 ends with the divine judgment in

8:17-18, and now YHWH appears as an ultimate judge. YHWH does not educate Ben Adam any

more. The appearance of the glory of the God of Israel also functions here as a set-up for the throne of the highest deity YHWH, the God of Israel, as the ultimate judge. Michael Chyutin interprets the throne chariot with the glory in the book of Ezekiel as a heterotopia because it breaks through heaven and earth.[329]

YHWH, being surrounded by his glorious aura, having some company, is now making a transition from the guide figure earlier. This shows the close connection to the Bronze Man of the final vision in chs. 40-48. There, too, the two-fold presentation was given to the readers: the Bronze Man was a very active figure at first to set up the structure by measuring the temple structure, but after the return of the glory in ch. 43, he gradually became passive and yielded his guide role to YHWH himself. Ezekiel 8-10 shows the opposite direction. YHWH first acted as a tour guide in Ezekiel 8. On the contrary, from chapter 9, after the completion of the accusations and the proclamation of the judgement at the end of chapter 8, the text changes its presentational strategy that YHWH sits on his throne and employs the active character the Linen Man.

When determining the formal structure, several issues come up. One of the issues is that, from this point up to the second "Spirit Lifted Me Up" in chapter 11, Ben Adam the character does not move, while the perception of the narrator Ben Adam is almost unlimitedly extended. This will invite another interesting study of the prolepsis in the narrative but it will be discussed in the following section. Here, I set up the formal structure just by following the flow of the formal signal of the whole vision narrative. Since the form critical reading of Ezekiel 8-11 in making the structure sets up the spatial markers which affect to Ben Adam the character as the most significant form, the ultimate judge scene in ch. 9 and the departure of the glory in ch. 10 should remain under the first "the Spirit Lifted Me Up," the ultimate signal of the vision scene,

---

[329] Michael Chyutin, *Architecture and Utopia in the Temple Era* (New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 220-24.

169

and the fourth "He Brought Me Up," the second ultimate signal. However, as we shall see, this formal structure may not show the picture comprehensive to understand the text's semantic level, and calls the interpreter to consult the thematic structure, too.

Another issue is how to interpret symbolic key words such as the executioners from the north, appearance of the Linen Man with the writing case, etc. Sweeney provides valuable insights based on historical settings and inner biblical exegesis. Regarding the six executioners armed with the destroying weapons from the north gate, Sweeney suggests reading a text's possible allusion of the Babylonian invasion from the north gate. Linen Man, the person in charge of this divine execution, for Sweeney, represents a heavenly priest, correspondent to the earthly Jerusalem priest, like Ben Adam himself.[330] This interpretation also makes sense because in the biblical tradition, often both the tabernacle in the wilderness and the Jerusalem temple were believed to be built by imitating the heavenly palace style. As we shall see in the section From Heterotopia to Heterotopia in Chapter 8, this theological interpretation of their national tragedy as the solemn divine decision is itself the resistant writing, or the writing as a resistant act of making the past renewed.

For not interfering with the uniqueness of this unit, further discussion of Structure and Genres and Languages sections will be integrated to 4.1.2.3 Further Study on the Narrative Situation in 9:6-8.

4.1.2.1.2 Settings

The social setting of Ezekiel 9 makes readers reflect on the role of the prophet or prophetic literature. We have already seen in this chapter the shift of YHWH's role from the temple tour guide as educator or accuser to the ultimate judge. Eventually, in the book of Ezekiel

---

[330] See Sweeney, "Ezekiel's Zadokite Priest and Visionary Prophet of Exile."

Ben Adam the character plays the role of a watchman or witness rather than of a prophet in accordance with the traditional notion. His main task is then to hold tight, as a watchman does, his contemporary audience to their *status quo* no matter how deeply frustrated they are by their God. In this context and in the larger contexts of the prophetic literature, the argument that the primary intention of the prophecy must be to call to repent would be questioned.[331] Michael Fishbane also argued that Ezekiel 8-11 does not intend that the judgment in the vision is conditional depending on the addressee's change of their wicked attitude, since the judgment is firm and is followed by the immediate execution.[332] In fact, in many portions of the book of Ezekiel, we experience difficulty in identifying the call to repent as the practical goal of the prophecies. As Raitt analyzes, the detailed idolatry presentations in Ezekiel 8 and 11 are rather with the aim of justification of the punishment.[333] Thus, we may conclude that not only from the 8th century prophets but also from the exilic and postexilic prophets can we find the strong intention to reveal YHWH's complete control in his judgment decision, rather than the call-to-repent themes.

As a further question, we ask: what would be the effect of these prophecies? The answer from scholars including von Rad and Hans. W. Wolff is to gain the apologetic answers on the

---

[331] For example, Martin Buber, *Der Glaube der Propheten*, Werke II: Schrifetn zur Bibel (München und Heidelberg, 1964); Georg Fohrer, *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie,* BZAW 99 (Berlin, 1967), 16. Also, a study of Blaženka Scheuer is interesting in dealing with the relationship between repentance and redemption as well as the discrepancy between the literary presentation and the conception. Blaženka Scheuer, *The Return of YHWH: The Tension between Deliverance and Repentance in Isaiah 40-55*, BZAW 377 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).

[332] Fishbane, "Sin and Judgment," 135-38.

[333] Raitt, *Theology of Exile*, 47-49.

severe disasters. They argued that the prophecies were focused on the proclamation of the

unavoidable judgment and justifiable reasons for it—usually as sins of Israel.[334]

4.1.2.1.3 Further Study on the Narrative Situation in Ezekiel 9:6-8

In order to appreciate any kind of literary work, readers first need to identify the form of

the text: who tells what to whom in what contexts. Regarding this process of reading

comprehension, we modern people expect more difficulty in the post-modern literature, but we

encounter this experience also from the ancient text reading such as the Bible. Ezekiel 9:6-8 is

the case; the basics of who tells what to whom in what contexts are not at all easy to identify.

Step by step, the following offers a "how to" for this difficult task.

Let us first read the text, paying attention to the highlighted clauses:

6 "Old men, young men, maidens, children, and women, you must utterly slay; but any person on whom is the mark, you must not touch. From my holy place, you should begin." **Then they began with the elders who were before the house**. 7Then **he said to them**, "Defile the house, and fill the courts with the slain. Go out." **So they went out and smote in the city. 8And while they were smiting, and I was left alone, I** fell upon **my** face, and cried, "Ah, YHWH God! Will **you** destroy all the remnant of Israel in the outpouring of **your** wrath on Jerusalem?" (Translation and emphasis are mine)

Within the framework of the vision narrative (Ezekiel 8-11), Ezekiel 9 deals with the

divine commands-executions of defiling the temple and smiting in the city. In this very dramatic

presentation, the author continues to employ the homodiegetic character-narrator Ben Adam as a

storyteller. The questions arise when we read the highlighted parts: whose voices are we hearing

now? Is it Ben Adam the character-narrator? If the teller of the highlighted parts were also he,

how could Ben Adam the finite human being know someone's activity, concurrently happening

beyond his presence? Isn't it clear from the text that Ben Adam does not move since 8:16 but

---

[334] Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper, 1962), 141; Hans. W. Wolff, "Die eigentliche Botschaft der klassischen Propheten," in *Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie, Festschrift W. Zimmerli*, ed. Herbert Donner, Robert Hanhart and Rudolf Smend (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1977), 547-57.

stays with YHWH at the inner court of the temple? Even if we may emphasize the freedom of

vision narrative and argue that everything could happen (what) in every way of expression (how),

how shall we explain this peculiar "freedom" happening only in this destruction scene, not

anywhere throughout all visions in the book of Ezekiel?[335] These basic but challenging questions

make us experience this discourse as an unintelligible text, and provoke us to reread it focusing

more attention on the compositional strategies.

To settle this problem, understanding the narrative situation of this specific sub-unit

within the larger context is necessary. Let us then look at the story line of Ezekiel 8-11. The

narrative begins with the implied inquiry for the divine oracle from the elders of Judah at the

house of Ben Adam in Tel-Abib, Babylon.[336] When Ben Adam was waiting for the oracle at his

house with them, the hand of YHWH came upon him, and in the vision the Spirit lifted him up to

the temple in Jerusalem. The following story thus occurs in the vision. YHWH leads Ben Adam

to show abominable images and scenes in a fourfold manner, from the gate to the inner court,

and from less serious to the greater provocative scenes. All of the abominable things then

become the content of YHWH's accusations so that the divine judgement upon Jerusalem and

the temple was inevitably proclaimed. Unlike other prophetic judgment oracles including those

in the book of Ezekiel, ch. 9 shows that immediate execution right after YHWH's solemn verdict,

when he calls for the executioners and the heavenly priestly figure from the north gate. This

divine command-execution scene is the beginning of Ezekiel 9 and this unit continues until the

---

[335] It is true that the indirect delivery of the news report form about the fall of Jerusalem is strategically employed throughout the book of Ezekiel. For example, in 33:21 as well as in ch. 9, characters, the narrator, and therefore readers, all together, are not allowed to witness the miserable scene in their eyes.

[336] This implied ritualistic inquiry for the divine presence becomes more explicit when Ezek. 20:1 mentions the verb "to inquire": "Certain of the elders of Israel came to inquire of YHWH, and sat before me" (20:1).

chief executioner reappears on the scene to report the completion of the divine commends in 9:11.

Now, the following thematic structure will help us figure out the communicative map. The problematic clauses, 9:6b, 9:7b, and 9:8a, are underlined to mark the appearance of the possible outside narrator in the first-person homodiegetic narrative.

YHWH, THE DESTROYER OF HIS OWN CITY   9:1-9:11

1. Beginning: Setup for the Divine Verdict	9:1-3a
1) Divine command #1 to bring the executioners	9:1
a) Narrator's report on God's command:	
(emphasis on the direct hearing)	9:1aα
b) Direct divine speech	9:1aβ-b
2) Fulfillment of the command #1	9:2
a) Narrator's description of the six men's coming	9:2aα
b) Narrator's description of the Linen Man's coming	9:2aβ
c) Narrator's report on their standing by the altar	9:2b
3) Advent of the glory of God to proclaim the verdict	9:3a
2. Development: Verdict and Execution	9:3b-9:7
1) Divine command #2 to the linen man	9:3b-9:4
a) Narrator's report on YHWH's calling him	9:3b
b) Direct Divine Speech	9:4
i) Speech formula	$9:4a\alpha^{1-3}$
ii) Speech per se: put the mark on the mourners	$9:4a\alpha^{4-6}$-b
2) Narrator's report on the divine command #3 to the six men	9:5
a) Speech formula (emphasis on the direct hearing)	9:5a
b) Speech per se	9:5b-9:6a
3) Homo-/Heterodiegetic[337] narrator's report on the fulfillment #3	9:6b
4) Narrator's report on the divine command #4 to the six men	9:7a
a) Speech formula	9:7aα
b) Speech per se	9:7aβ
5) Heterodiegetic narrator's report on the fulfillment #4	9:7b

---

[337] "homo-/hetero-" means the context of the clause allows both interpretations depending on the perspectives. For example, 9:6b can be interpreted as the report of Ben Adam's perception since its action starts from the temple and the open space may allow the extensive eyesight. On the other hand, however, if the text sets the stage of the execution beyond the inner-court space, this verse should be narrated by the heterodiegetic narrator.

3. Climax: Ben Adam's Appeal to YHWH and Its Failure 9:8-10

1) Narrator's report on the narrative situation 9:8a
   a) <u>Heterodiegetic narrator's restatement for the transmission</u> 9:8aα
   b) Homodiegetic narrator's report on Ben Adam's situation 9:8aβ
2) Ben Adam's appeal 9:8bα-bγ
   a) Set up for the appeal .... $9{:}8b\alpha^{1\text{-}3}$
   b) Speech formula .... $9{:}8b\alpha^{4}$
   c) Speech per se .... $9{:}8\ b\alpha^{5}\text{-}b\gamma$
3) YHWH's response as another accusation 9:9-10
   a) Speech formula .... $9{:}9a\alpha^{1\text{-}2}$
   b) Speech per se .... $9{:}9a\alpha^{3\text{-}}10$
      i) Accusations .... $9{:}9a\alpha^{3}\text{-}9b$
         (1) General statement on the house of Israel and Judah .... $9{:}9a\alpha^{3\text{-}8}$
         (2) Great sins upon the land and the city 9:9aβ-aγ
         (3) Quotation of their sayings 9:9b
            (a) Speech formula .... $9{:}9b\alpha^{1\text{-}2}$
            (b) Speech per se .... $9{:}9b\alpha^{3}\text{-}b\beta$
      ii) Punishment 9:10

4. Ending: Execution is completed 9:11

1) Appearance of the Linen Man at the courtyard 9:11aα
2) His report 9:11aβ-b
   a) Speech formula 9:11aβ
   b) Speech per se 9:11b

As shown above, our verses 9:6-8 are located in the Development: Verdict and Execution (9:3b-9:7), and the Climax: Ben Adam's Appeal to YHWH and its Failure (9:8-9:10). These two subunits clearly show that the narrative takes place in the inner court of the temple, not the city or other places of the temple.

Likewise, by understanding the narrative situation of Ezek. 9:6-8 with the help of the lager-context analysis and thematic structure analysis, I find that Ezek. 9:6-8 shows the unique feature that a first person narrative allows a heterodiegetic narrator to narrate. In other words, yes, the voice of 9:6b, 9:7b, and 9:8a, especially 9:7b, is different from the homodiegetic narrator Ben Adam whom we have seen so far. This omniscient owner of that voice is neither YHWH nor Ben

Adam, i.e., the voice is not a character's speech. He is absolutely not the implied author, either. Nonetheless, he is free from the stream of the narrative since he exists outside the story. This is my brief diagnosis on the narrative situation of 9:6-8.

With this diagnosis as a stepping stone, I pose several more questions. First of all, do all three verses have a genuine heterodiegetic narrator? In order to assert this argument, what kind of investigation do we need? Is it worthy to study this text synchronically, even though scholars have attributed this abrupt change of the voices to the hypothetical editorial layers in their diachronic approaches?[338] If the synchronic reading makes the case of its value, what does it mean to readers that we read the text which shows the coexistence of the homo-and heterodiegetic narrator in one unit? Why did the author use this device even by breaking the grammar of the narrative space? What made the author/editor do so? To what effect would this sudden intrusion by the heterodiegetic narrator work in defining the overall genre of the book of Ezekiel? Finally, how shall we understand the common topic of all three cases (9:6b, 9:7a, and 9:8b), the execution report of the destruction of the city? Is it accidental? Or somewhat intentional to use the heterodiegetic narration in this specific content?

Let us look at the cases more closely with the review of scholar's comments on these so far.

4.1.2.1.3.1 Regarding the voices: With the history of interpretation

[Cases of 9:6b and 9:8a]

These two verses show somewhat ambiguous situation regarding the heterodiegetic narrator. The narrator judgment on 9:6b "Then they began with the elders who were before the house" would depend on the sight of Ben Adam. Depending on that judgment, the conjunction

---

[338] For example, Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, "Probleme einer 'ganzheitlichen Lektüre' der Schrift. Dargestellt am Beispiel Ez 9-10," *TQ* 167 (1987): 266-77.

w^e can be translated either "thus" or "then." If one takes the translation 'thus," the sense of heterodiegetic narration would be increased as a report from outside the event while the option "then" would give more present sense of the narrator as description of the action. Maybe due to this ambiguity, Zimmerli doesn't make a decisive call on this issue, but implies his understanding of this clause as the scene that Ben Adam could see in the same place.[339] In my discourse analysis reading, Ezekiel 9:6b is the case of the maximum capacity of the homodiegetic narration.

The case of 9:8a "And while they were smiting," is also interesting. Zimmerli gives no comment on this clause, either. Thomas Renz rearranges the order of the verses so that he reconstructs the several scenes according to his logic.[340] I think Renz's rearrangement comes from the recognition of the difficulty in deciding the temporal sequence, rather than admitting the difficulty as a narrator-character matter. But his solution is not convincing since he did not take the real issue of the verse which lies in the impossible arrangement of the heterodiegetic narrator in the homodiegetic narrative. If the discourse has the heterodiegetic narrator and he works as the omniscient narrator, then character Ben Adam's duty becomes much lighter that he should function only as a spectator who cannot see the whole picture but lives with a limited power and sight. But, the case is not applicable to Ezekiel 9.

Verse 9:8a may be homodiegetic too, because the heterodiegetic narrator in 9:7b can influence not only to his readers but also to the homodiegetic narrator-character Ben Adam. In other words, after the narrative experience of 9:7b—report of the city's being smitten, that heterodiegetic narrator handovers his duty to the homodiegetic narrator in 9:8a and goes back

---

[339] Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 248.

[340] Renz, *The Rhetorical Function of the Book of Ezekiel*, 186.

behind the story again. Thus, it functions as transitional. In 9:8a, the homodiegetic narrator Ben

Adam takes the baton from the hand of the heterodiegetic narrator in 9:7b and sets up for the

character Ben Adam's appeal to YHWH in 9:8b. Thus, this "I" learned that the striking

execution is still ongoing. This is the interesting phenomenon in the narrative; i.e., the

heterodiegetic narrator influences the homodiegetic narrator.

[The Case of 9:7b]

Ezekiel 9:7b "So they went out and smote in the city" shows a very conspicuous case of

the proleptic narration by the heterodiegetic narrator. In its reception history, we see a simple and

clear-cut interpretation of this verse in the LXX version, i.e., LXX does not keep the problematic

9:7b but omitted. Greenberg attributes this omission to a possible different *Volarge*,[341] but for

me it seems due to the LXX's literary tendency to pursue the textual unity and coherence.

Zimmerli argues that it is misreading of LXX to have הַחֲצֵרוֹת (Ezek. 9:7) as τὰς ὁδοὺς (Ezek.

9:7), and prefers the MT reading.[342] The Peshitta also interprets these phrases as imperatives.

Greenberg argues that this word must be an imperative in the original setting, and based on the

same consonants, the gloss or misspelling phenomenon happened.[343]The clear thing is that LXX

translation is one of the interpretations of this tall order. Most English translations take 9:7b as

the statement not the continuation of the divine speech, probably due to the subject change from

---

[341] Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 178. Of course, there are three possible ways to conjecture when we see the differences between the two different versions like MT and LXX: 1) LXX omits the part of the proto MT; 2) MT adds its part when translating the Old Greek; and 3) the two different versions reflect the two different *Vorlage*. Here I chose the first possibility based on Johann Albrecht Bengel's *proclivi scriptioni praestat ardua* (Before the easy reading, stands the difficult). It is hardly plausible that the later text gets more difficulty by adding what is absent in its mother text.

[342] Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 225.

[343] Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 178. Cf. Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 100.

the second person masculine plural as the implied subject of the imperatives in 9:7a to the third person common plural as the implied subject of the declarative verbs in 9:7b. For Zimmerli, this sudden appearance of omnipresent narrator's statement must be disturbing so that he concludes on this clause as the supplementary information to 9:7.[344] Daniel Block seems to be rather interested in the content coherence between this verse and 11:1-13. He points that in the former situation we are informed the annihilation of the Jerusalem population while in the latter scene we see the survivors including twenty-five prominent men.[345] Leaning to the diachronic approach, commentators usually stop at finishing off of the awkward phenomenon as later insertions. Greenberg also puts away this phenomenon as the result of dittography, the unintentional repetitive words or phrases.[346] He mentions this apparently repeated command is "not a mere parallel but an explicit divine license to commit an unthinkable desecration."[347] Nonetheless, in my eyes, this so-called "dittography" phenomenon can be very intentional, and one of our tasks is to find out whose intention might have worked in making the present form.

The review of many interpretations on 9:7b suggests that scholarly investigations have not yet reached a satisfactory conclusion, and the analyses quit midway cannot be a help in understanding the present form of the text more in-depth. Diachronically speaking, yes it might be an insertion; but, if that is the conclusion on this phenomenon, it would be too simple and superficial. Going further, my study asks the motives or desires of the editors who made the insertion, here, in this form. Although we have admitted that the authorial intention is hard to grasp from the reader's perspective, this obvious editorial work invites us again to take the

---

[344] Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 248-49.

[345] Block, *Ezekiel 1-24*, 273.

[346] Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 178.

[347] Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 178.

challenge to figure out the mind of the final redactor. As Sweeney points out, the redactors are

not the simple mechanics but theologians as well as the creators of the literary work.[348] Not

being satisfied with the diachronic explanation, despite the full notice of the multiple editorial

layers, we need to go back to the given present form and do synchronic synthesis. Yes, the study

is worthy to continue.

Now, finding the motivation of the insertion involves a rigorous study of grammatical

matters. Firstly, the tense matter. Unlike the clearly distinctive form of *waw* consecutive

imperfect (*waw*-YQTL), w[e] consecutive perfect (w[e]-QTL) and simple perfect with conjunction

are identical in many cases. Because of this phenomenon, now interpreters need to decide the

temporal aspect of the two clauses. The first grammatical difficulty lies in its improper mode.

Gesenius categorizes these two clauses as the example of "the errors in the text or incorrect

modes of expression." But as he lists, in this case, we need to remember that many perfect verbs

with the simple w[e] conjunction have been translated as the perfect aspect with the simple

conjunction "and."[349]

Judges 16:18, having the same syntactical structure with Ezekiel 9:7, is a good example

for this usage. In the following example, the same color highlights show the same kind of

syntactic features: as in order, *waw*-YQTL, direct speech with the speech formula, imperative

within the direct speech, and the narrator's report on the execution of the demands in the speech.

One of the differences is that in Judges 16:18 the last verb goes back to the *waw*-YQTL while the

last two verbs of Ezekiel 9:7b do not return to the first verb form of 9:7a.

---

[348] Sweeney, *Form and Intertextuality*, 2-5.

[349] Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar,* § 49. The Perfect and Imperfect with waw Consecutive; Gary D. Pratico and Miles V. Van Pelt, *Basics of Biblical Hebrew: Grammar*, 2nd edition (Zondervan, 2007), 200-205.

Judges 16:18 וַתֵּ֣רֶא דְלִילָ֗ה כִּֽי־הִגִּ֣יד לָהּ֮ אֶת־כָּל־לִבּוֹ֒ וַתִּשְׁלַ֡ח וַתִּקְרָא֩ לְסַרְנֵ֨י פְלִשְׁתִּ֤ים לֵאמֹר֙ עֲל֣וּ הַפַּ֔עַם כִּֽי־הִגִּ֥יד (לָהּ) [לִ֖י] אֶת־כָּל־לִבּ֑וֹ וְעָל֤וּ אֵלֶ֙יהָ֙ סַרְנֵ֣י פְלִשְׁתִּ֔ים וַיַּעֲל֥וּ הַכֶּ֖סֶף בְּיָדָֽם:

Ezekiel 9:7 וַיֹּ֨אמֶר אֲלֵיהֶ֜ם טַמְּא֣וּ אֶת־הַבַּ֗יִת וּמַלְא֤וּ אֶת־הַחֲצֵרוֹת֙ חֲלָלִ֔ים צֵ֕אוּ וְיָצְא֖וּ וְהִכּ֥וּ בָעִֽיר:

As we have seen that the natural translation in Judges 16:18bα (Then, the chiefs of Philistines came up to her) takes the past tense/the perfect aspect, it would be also natural to read Ezekiel 9:7b as "and they went out and slew in the city." The following verse 9:8a confirms this past tense interpretation. Also, Greenberg supports my argument that the verbal tense of 9:7b should be perfect in terms of "the sequel to a command narrating its fulfilment."[350]

Another grammatical matter is, even in the first time casual reading, that we come to notice that 9:7b is spoken by a different agent from other verses of this unit. While 9:7a is the report of the divine speech by the homodiegetic narrator Ben Adam using the quotation formula ויאמר, 9:7b, the report of the execution in some other place, shows something beyond the first person narrator-character can do. In other words, the author of this narrative suddenly shows his readers the two incompatible things: the temporally and spatially bound narrator-character Ben Adam and the narrator who can report the simultaneous situation. The following verse 9:8a "while they were striking," influenced by the previous clause, also shows the shadow of this omniscient narrator, although, as I mentioned above, eventually this clause is subordinated to the main clause of the first person narration in 9:8b.

In sum, the grammar analyses above help the exploration of the questions: who saw the executioners' destroying activities and who speaks this in what context? Why does the author suddenly change the agent at this point?

---

[350] Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 178.

Through this multi-perspective study of discourse analysis, I suggest to see this "voice" of 9:7b as the "voice-over narration." The term "voice-over" in the film or narrative refers to "the voice coming from another time and space, the time and space of the discourse" not from the story.[351] Sarah Kozloff argues that in this case of voice-over narration in the first person narrative, we see this uncontrolled voice out of the story, but because the narration clearly has the narratee, the voice-over narrator should not be treated as monologue.[352] This would be rather the case that the text shows a different perspective of the text.

Finally, answering the questions that I set, the following table shows the narrative map of Ezekiel 9:6-8. Four different colorings represent different agents and the different narrative situations: light blue as character's speech or statement; light purple as flexible application of the homo/heterodiegetic narrator's statement; light green as the clear cases of homodiegetic narration; and light apricot as the clear heterodiegetic narration.

verses	Who	To whom	What	Notes
9:6a	Character YHWH's speech	Character six executors	Kill the unmarked people from the sanctuary	Divine command
9:6b	Hetero/homodiegetic narrator's report	Implied readers	Report on the **execution** of the divine command: **killing people** in the temple has been started	-Execution of the people in ch. 8 -May or may not visible to character Ben Adam

---

[351] Sarah Kozloff, *Invisible Storytellers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 3.

[352] Kozloff, *Invisible Storytellers*, 43-44, 50.

9:7aα	Homodiegetic narrator's report	Implied readers	Report on the divine speech	A setting for the new command after the fulfilment of 9:6a command
9:7aβ	Character YHWH's speech	Character six executors	Defile the temple with the slain in the city	Divine command
9:7b	Heterodiegetic narrator's report	Implied readers	Report on the **execution** of the divine command: **killing people** in the city has been executed.	Immediate and perfect fulfillment; prolepsis: any other efforts to reverse the command would be useless.
9:8aα	Heterodiegetic or homodiegetic narrator's report	Implied readers	Retelling the **execution of striking**	Set up to present the onstage event; concurrent time sharing makes possible with this report Transitional piece from the omniscient heterodiegetic narrator to the homodiegetic narrator
9:8aβ	Homodiegetic narrator's report	Implied readers	Ben Adam's presence with YHWH	"I" first person
9:8bα[4]	Homodiegetic narrator's report	Implied readers	Speech formula: Ben Adam to (YHWH)	Speech formula with the strong verb "cry"
9:8 bα[5]-bγ	Character Ben Adam	Character YHWH	Do not destroy all the remnant from your wrath	More tragic appeal with 9:7b and 9:8a

Nobody so far, in my knowledge, pays attention to the intention of the text behind this insertion phenomenon and the possible agony of the author. With the acknowledgement of the

diachronic phenomena, with the respect of the present form of the text, and with the conviction

of the text's intention/pursuit for the communication between author and reader, now I turn to the

world of the editors/redactors or the present form of the text.

4.1.2.1.3.2 Regarding the Grammar: 9:6b and 9:8a, the Maximum Extension of the Homodiegetic Narration

Let us recall the technical terms that narrative theories use in general. Narrator is the

agent who gives an account of the events and descriptions verbally. In its delivery, narrator can

take either the limited viewpoint of a character inside the story, which does not know anything

outside the character's perception; or the omniscient viewpoint of someone who knows

everything somehow. As I introduced in Chapter 2 Methodologies, the term "focalization" helps

to avoid confusion with the earlier usages of the terms "point of view" or "perspective" which is

often used to denote narrative voice as well.[353] Focusing on the contextual situation, Franz

Stanzel also distinguishes between the first-person narrative situation and the authorial narrative

situation which may be correspondent with Genette's terms homodiegetic/heterodiegetic.[354]

Genette's terms have been modified by Rimmon-Kenan who uses the distinct terms of the

external focalizer and the internal focalizer.[355]

As we have seen, my form critical analysis of Ezekiel 8-11 has already distinguished Ben

Adam as Ben Adam character from Ben Adam narrator even in the homodiegetic narrative.

Unfortunately, neither of them can go out together with the executioners in Ezekiel 9, because

---

[353] Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, 189-94.

[354] Franz K. Stanzel, *Narrative Situations in the Novel: Tom Jones, Moby-Dick, The Ambassadors, Ulysses* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971), 6; idem, *A Theory of Narrative* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 535-38. He introduces a third type of narrative situation.

[355] Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, 74.

Ben Adam the character and Ben Adam the narrator can only be separated when the time allows each agent's different experiences. The example of Ezekiel 8:3b, the information about the jealous image, is the case that the narrator Ben Adam shares what he knew already with the implied audience who also knew the fact. Ben Adam character appears to pretend being in a sleeping mode, while the narrator Ben Adam shares his knowledge of the seat of the jealous image with his readers. It sounds awkward in a traditional narrative mode of reading, but when we read the narrative like a script that we need to perform, the two layers of different presentations can be understood. It can be analogous to the configuration where the character is standing on the stage but the spotlight has not fallen upon him yet.

Mark McEntire argues that the first person point of view prevents Ezekiel from becoming like a background but reminds readers that Ezekiel exists as an eyewitness.[356] I interpret this as the role of character-narrator Ben Adam. Unlike most scenes of vision narratives in which Ben Adam played an eyewitness role, we encounter the indirect report about the fall of the city in Ezekiel 9. One may argue that this is the vision which allows any kind of imagination or illusion by the character as much as possible. With due respect, let us ponder a bit more over this claim. If Ben Adam imagines, and if Ben Adam sees the activity of the executioners in the vision of the vision, this imagination would reach to the maximum boundary which the homodiegetic narrator can go. Without hearing and without seeing, Ben Adam may imagine the slaughtering scene, or he might see what YHWH saw as Edgar Conrad argues.[357] It would be possible. However, even if this were a correct logic, we need to admit that it is obvious that the author did not allow the character's presentation as such. There is no narration saying that Ben Adam imagined.

---

[356] Mark McEntire, *A Chorus of Prophetic Voices: Introducing the Prophetic Literature of Ancient Israel* (John Knox, 2015), 120.

[357] Edgar Conrad, *Reading the Latter Prophets: Toward A New Canonical Criticism*, JSOTSup 376 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 165-78.

Unfortunately, 9:7b is a very ordinary sentence by a heterodiegetic narrator. Thus, the option of the character's imagination should be discarded, and we need to ponder the world where the heterodiegetic narrator and homodiegetic narrator coexist in one unit.

4.1.2.1.3.3. Regarding the content: what made the author invite the narrator?

[Dilemma between Grammar and Desires: Two Incompatible Desires]

With this theoretical base, now we explore the intentions of this narrative situation. Tzvetan Todorov's distinction between a narrative's "story" (mainly character's experience) and its "discourse" (the narrative as it is recounted to the audience)[358] would be helpful for this study, since our text also shows the distinction between the story and discourse regarding the accessibility of information. In the narrative time of Ezekiel 9:6-8, what the character Ben Adam knew would be less than what the readers learn; or at least he would be late by one tempo to the readers in getting information because the author employs the heterodiegetic narrator to tell his readers the information of the city situation. The order of delivery makes a difference between the reality experienced by a narrative's characters and its readers. In a Greek term, this is the basic distinction between διήγησις (narrator text) and μίμησις (character text). Moreover, as Gary Yamasaki points out, the first person narrator should keep the rule of limitation in reporting the events; then, in exchange, he or she gets the empathy from the reader more easily than any other kinds of narration.[359]

While the employment of the narrator gains these effects, the effort to keep the divine court area as the narrative space works for the narrative to avoid the bloody massacre scene in a graphic mimesis manner. Also, the report at the end of the narrative as the conclusion appears

---

[358] Tzvetan Todorov, "The Categories of Literary Narrative," *Paper on Language & Literature* 16, no. 1 (1980): 3-36.

[359] Gary Yamasaki, *Watching a Biblical Narrative: Point of View in Biblical Exegesis* (New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 154.

that the eye-witness style of the depiction was not the intention of the author in the first place. The limitation of the space to one station, then, can be understood to have been employed for the effect of the urgent delivery. The crucial information of immediate execution must be delivered both to the character Ben Adam and to the reader as reality as soon as it occurred. Besides, the following appeal of Ben Adam achieves more serious and urgent effects, when it is based on that immediacy of the execution.

Now, we see the two desires of the narrator in this unit: one is to show and tell the character Ben Adam to be with YHWH, and the other is to let readers know the decisive moment of destruction of the city, ahead of the time when Ben Adam appeals to YHWH. Is it possible that YHWH guides Ben Adam to the destruction place as he did in the temple tour in chapter 8? I would say "No," since YHWH has changed his role when he starts the judgement in 8:17-18, i.e., he is not the kind tour guide anymore as he was before this point. In chapter 9, YHWH does not move; rather, he *should not* move because he *is* the king of kings.

Although I describe this situation as "two incompatible desires," it is indeed compatible in the heterodiegetic narrative situation. If the author employs the heterodiegetic narrator and gives him the omniscient and omnipotent power to hover the whole narrative, the story will flow well according to the narrator's lead without pause. Exodus 25-31 and 32:1-6 are a good example of concurrent stories, one on the mountain top and the other on the ground level. I will bring up this case later in Proleptic Focalization section. Although there exists the proleptic narration before the narrator starts the concurrent stories, the heterodiegetic narration like Exodus 24-32 has no problem. The problem occurs only here in Ezekiel 9 since the author chose the form of eye-witness style from the first person narrator in almost entire book of Ezekiel.

1. Proleptic Focalization

According to Gérard Genette, prolepsis is "any narrative maneuver that consists of narrating or evoking in advance an event that will take place later."[360] This proleptic narration in fact can be explained as "breaking the fourth wall" in the Brehict's epic drama.[361] Before looking at the effect of the proleptic narration[362] in our text, let us read the Exodus case as an example of the proleptic narration in the heterodiegetic narrative.

As briefly mentioned above, Exodus 25-31 and Exodus 32:1-6 should be read as the two concurrent events but are presented in a time-related manner since narrative is the temporal art like music. Let us read Exodus 24:17-18, the moment the narrator uses proleptic narration for preparing the concurrent narratives.

> [17] Now the appearance of the glory of the LORD was like a devouring fire on the top of the mountain in the sight of the people of Israel.
> [18] Moses entered the cloud and went up on the mountain. And Moses was on the mountain forty days and forty nights. (Exod. 24:17-18 ESV)

In Exod. 24:16, only six days have passed after the covenant making scene in Exodus 24:1-15. The next verse, 24:17 is a kind of preparation scene for the coming concurrent presentation and describes the whole picture of Mount Sinai from the people's focalization. To the eyes of Israel people, no content from the dialogue between YHWH and Moses is heard but only "devouring fire on the top of the mountain" continues burning. When the narrative arrives at 24:17-18, the temporal distance becomes suddenly huge as much as "forty days and forty nights." This "forty days and forty nights" statement should come later at the end of chapter 31 since the

---

[360] Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, 40.

[361] Cf. Tom Brown, *Breaking the Fourth Wall: Direct Address in the Cinema* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012), 1-21.

[362] On the narratological terms *prolepsis* and *analepsis*, see Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, 35-36; Bal, *Narratology*, 84.

narrative time of 40 days and nights has just passed in 31:18, not in 24:18. This is a proleptic narration whose primary function is to embrace the *inclusio*. In this case, the mountain top scene of 40 days is presented in seven chapters (chs. 25-31) while the ground scene of 40 days is depicted in six verses (32:1-6).

In the deliverance of the simultaneously happening stories, the Exodus author uses two omniscient agents. One is the heterodiegetic narrator who has also the omniscient eyes like God. The other is the omniscient character YHWH who knows everything so that he can tell the invisible episode happening down on the ground to the limited character Moses who cannot perceive the event of the ground. For the author of Exodus text who employs the heterodiegetic narrator, proleptic narration is not a matter of hesitation for its employment, with the worry of violating the grammar rule; it is only a matter of focalization. Thus, the author arranges different camera angles at 24:17, 24:18, and 31:18 by putting the several narrator's comments on each juncture.

Nonetheless, such an option was not possible in the narrative of the first-person finite character and narrator; even though its genre is a vision, the rule of communication still governs the narrative. Our Ezekiel text has no choice and no room for adjustment. The solution would be either giving up the desire of proleptic narration or breaking up the rule of grammar. Brilliantly the author of the book of Ezekiel (rather the editor as a Middle Author of my term) brought the self-effaced heterodiegetic narrator to the front stage, who once appeared in 1:3 but disappeared back to the world of discourse.

Following is the summary of the probable concerns that the final editor could have in mind based on the text presentation analysis above. First, the disastrous execution shall be delivered before the Linen Man utters as a report. Second, the two situations should be

189

considered as the concurrent events but with the order of the execution statement first, and then the appeal of Ben Adam scene later. Third, character Ben Adam should be with YHWH during the execution to appeal to him.

2. Echo of the Abrahamic Lament in Ben Adam's Lament

In consideration of the proleptic narration effect, I as a reader of the Ezekiel text find the similar narrative situation in the Abraham story in Genesis 18, in which Abraham appealed to God concerning the Sodom and Gomorrah destruction. There are enough connections between the Abraham narrative and the book of Ezekiel as regards authorial intertextuality. First of all, the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah were mentioned in Ezekiel 16; Abraham's name is also mentioned in Ezekiel 33. Not only for the semantic connections but also the similar narrative situations are found in the two books. Ezekiel 22:30-31 states the reason for God's wrath upon Jerusalem lies in the failure of finding one person who can stand between the bloody city and God. If I would like to consult the authorial intertextuality by searching the probable direction of influence between the two texts, further diachronic study is required.[363] But, this is not the primary focus in the discussion of the proleptic narration. It is enough to say that the Ezekiel text shows enough evidence that at least the exilic community of the book of Ezekiel must have known the existence of Abraham and his story, especially his intercessory prayer concerning Sodom and Gomorrah. Wright argues that we have many examples that Sodom and Gomorrah became the paradigmatic symbol of the punished city throughout the biblical accounts.[364] From Wright's study, two things we can learn regarding the description of the fall of Jerusalem in

---

[363] I already introduced the scholarly discussions of the compositional dates between P and the book of Ezekiel in Part I and get the conclusion that Genesis 18-19, which contains P strata, can be an influencing text to the Ezekiel text.

[364] Wright, "Urbicide," 157-59.

Ezekiel 8-11. First insight comes from the intertextual allusion or echo of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah in Genesis. If Sodom and Gomorrah incident works as a more paradigmatic example of all the cursed and destroyed cities by YHWH, then our intertextual reading of Ezekiel 9 and 10 with Genesis 18-19 would be more reasonable. Second, once this incident becomes an analogy to the destruction of the city in the Bible world as well as in the ANE, as Wright asserts, the use of this example would easily transcend the detailed historical event, but more dependent on the reader's imagination of the horrible moments.

Now, let me introduce the narrative situation of Abraham with YHWH and his two messengers in Genesis 18. By using the two specific verbs (וַיָּקֻ֤מוּ מִשָּׁם֙ הָֽאֲנָשִׁ֔ים וַיַּשְׁקִ֖פוּ עַל־פְּנֵ֣י סְדֹ֑ם), 18:16 shows somewhat ambiguous statement of the two men. It is not clear whether they completely left Abraham's tent. One thing is clear though that the two messengers and Abraham left the main stage of the narrative, i.e., Abraham's tent, at this point for a while to give the time for the change of YHWH's mind. God left alone in vv. 17-19 and the narrative assigns the narrative space to YHWH to express his inner thought toward Abraham. The same divine speech has been changed without any framework of quotation by the narrator's introduction. The shift of the addressee is only possible to catch in the context, since YHWH's speech in vv. 20-21 does not take the dialogue form by calling Abraham's name. The two verses indeed simply take a divine announcement of judgment form. Due to the ambiguous status of the two men in 18:16 and due to the explicit mention of the two men's departure in 18:22, the two verses should be read together. The two verses are rather to be understood as embracing the divine inner thought and alleged proclamation in vv. 17-19.

Several common elements in the plot development between Genesis 18-19 and Ezekiel 9 make us more convincing to read the two texts together. First, in both cases YHWH did not

191

move to punish the designated city but let his messengers execute his commands. Moreover, the divine punishment was revealed before it happened in both narratives. Lastly, both narratives have room for the characters to appeal to God for the sake of the city, but in both cases, the result was not reversed. Only delay of the punishment and some individual's redemption (Lot's family) would happen in the Abraham narrative, while there is no fruit from Ben Adam's appeal in our text.

The decisive difference between the two accounts in fact lies in the flexibility of the judgment. The Abraham narrative shows very flexible and indeterminable characteristic of YHWH's decision. YHWH in Gen. 18:21 said he would investigate the city first. Interestingly, even the two messengers' departure is delayed until the revelation of YHWH's will to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah to Abraham in v. 21. The narrative plot of the Abraham narrative allows much time to repent for the Sodomites and expresses the procedure stage by stage. Although the two cities, Sodom and Gomorrah, were eventually destroyed, for the narrator to show every single step in destruction seems the matter in point. Unfortunately, in Ezekiel 9, the trial time has been passed long time ago and accordingly the repentant time has been all gone. Now, it is time to declare and to execute the ultimate destruction. The intention of the Ezekiel 9 text becomes more obvious when we read the two texts together; in fact, the book of Ezekiel wants to claim that Ben Adam was the one who appeals to God for the city. I would like to name this as the desire to echo the lament of Abraham in Genesis 18. If Jerusalem in Ezekiel 9 is as of Sodom and Gomorrah in Genesis 18-19, the *golah* community with Ezekiel is of Abraham.

The typical factors to discuss intertextuality include loose and motivic commonalities, thematic patterns, roles of the characterization, and the results.[365] In all these criteria, the two

---

[365] Cf. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture.*

texts show explicit connections, and this leads readers to conjecture possible authorial intertextual composition between them. The interpretation of the Ezekiel text with the intertextual reading of Genesis 18-19 is clear: although Jerusalemites argue that they are the successor of Abraham and the *golah* community is like the people in Sodom and Gomorrah, the Ezekiel text counter argues that they are the children of Abraham to whom YHWH revealed the plan of the fall of Sodom, whom YHWH saved, and who fell before YHWH and prayed for them.

With the recognition of Ben Adam's appeal in connection with Abraham's, still we have a question. Especially when we compare the two scenes, the curiosity of the proleptic treatment of Ezekiel 9 increases. Ultimately, the proleptic narration and the Ben Adam's appeal with that information have some rhetorical effects, but have no power to change YHWH's decision itself. Then, what is the intention of the text in using these literary and rhetorical devices? First, it helps to show that the divine judgment is firm enough and very immediate. Second, repentance is neither the option nor the purpose of this scene.[366] In this appeal scene, Ben Adam is depicted as Moses or Abraham who stands between the human beings and the deity. This scene is the most active scene for Ben Adam throughout the book of Ezekiel. Ben Adam in this portrayal was a priest par excellence, although the mediation was not accepted. This broadcast scene is also a good fit for delivering the news of the helpless situation. Contrary to this active-ness of Ben Adam, however, the decision of YHWH is so firm, and nobody can change now. Interestingly, the purpose of this scene can be found in the phrase "They will know that there was a prophet

---

[366] This would be somewhat challenging to the traditional view of the prophetic ministry. Contra H. Wildberger, *Jesaja (Jesaja 1-12)*, BKAT X/1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: 1972), 227. But see also for other opinions, Wolff, *Die eigentliche Botshaft*, 41.

among them" in Ezekiel's call narrative and the subsequent divine speeches.

In sum, using the known text, the author of Ezekiel 9 facilitates the better and deeper understanding of the destruction and prophet's laments; but assures that Abraham's well-disposed plea cannot make an effective case any more in Ezekiel's time.

Lastly, in regards to the destruction at this scene, Chapter 9 is more on the telling of it except a few scenes including the glory of YHWH scene (9:3) and 9:7. This verse, "So they struck in the city" seems strange in its taciturn manner. Here, suddenly the text uses "the narrator's short-spoken-telling strategy." In verse 8, the strange governance continues saying that "when they struck, I was alone"; so the character Ben Adam was not with them and Ben Adam was not witness. Without any report, or even before receiving/hearing that report, however, the narrator Ben Adam narrates what happened. This communicates the simultaneous empathy of Ezekiel, as the character, the narrator, and the implied author, to his audience, bespeaking that this is really a matter! As we shall see, this ambiguous and mysterious presentation appears again in the scene of Pelatiah's death when Ben Adam prophesies in 11:13. Exactly the same response bursts out from Ben Adam: "Will you kill all the remnants of Israel?"

3. What makes them have strong desire to confirm: the Point

Although I have discussed many strategies and polemics in this study, I would say that this desire of the proleptic narration is beyond strategy and beyond polemic. This is simply a pain! The city is fallen; it is smitten; and they, the heavenly executioners, did. Then, we ask, why does the author become reserved when describing the destruction of the city not to unfold the graphic violence in detail? The most convenient answer would be that it reflects the *Sitz im Leben* of Ben Adam and the Jehoiachin Babylonian captives. The fall of Jerusalem and the

194

temple are never seen to them (in mimesis way); but only heard from the eyewitness (in diegesis way). But, is it all?

4.1.2.1.3.4 The Fall of Jerusalem in the Vision, in the Analogy, and in the Eye-Witness Report

Here is something more. One of the effects of the proleptic narration lies in letting readers have a heterotopic experience in the same way Ben Adam character does on the scene. By inserting this narration immediately after the divine command, the author was able to show YHWH's power and strong will.

To explicate this argument, first of all, the study of Jerusalem is essential. If I would choose another key word besides "YHWH's sanctuary" in the book of Ezekiel, it would be the city Jerusalem, especially about her destiny. The interest of the book in Jerusalem indeed has never ceased even after the destruction of the city, and even in the restoration vision at the end. However, the memories of her should have died out in the people's mind; and therefore we the readers cannot hear her name Jerusalem any more in the book, either. Then, how is it possible that we are remembering Jerusalem? The complete prohibition on the word Jerusalem has a reverse effect and rather clearly inscribes the city Jerusalem both in the author's mind, character's mind, and the readers' mind, altogether.

Accordingly, the book of Ezekiel is serious when it takes the issue of the "fall" of Jerusalem. The fall of Jerusalem was prophesied first in chapters 4-7 with various sign-act performance commands. The fall of Jerusalem then was sentenced in 8:17-18 in the vision first, and she was killed immediately by the heavenly executioners. Both proclamation and execution were fulfilled without delay in the vision. When the narrative comes back to the realistic presentation in ch. 24, the story goes back to the past again, i.e., the time when the city was not

fallen yet; but has been seized by King Nebuchadnezzar. At this point, symbolically, with the death of Ben Adam's wife, the city got the death sentence. From this death sentence to the death report later, the literary delay with the OANs (chs. 25-32) are in between. In ch.33 finally, readers with the character Ben Adam got the report that the city was fallen.

In the proleptic narrative of the fall of Jerusalem, the heterodiegetic narrator occurred, which is the one and only throughout the entire book of Ezekiel. In detail, Ezekiel 9 projects the fall of Jerusalem and the divine abandonment of the temple, ahead of the time before the narrative reaches to the actual event in the story; and this gloomy projection continues until the decisive report from the fallen city is heard in 33:21.

In addition to the study of Jerusalem, the study of the effects of the 3rd person-voice illuminates more of the intentions. If the genre is related to God's vision, as Conrad argues, as "what God sees," Ezekiel 9:7b follows this awkwardly by overlapping the vision of God with the 3rd person narrator's perception. Then, who saw and who told? The answer would be: God and the 3rd person narrator indistinguishably. Between the two omniscient agents, Ezekiel 9:7b chooses the heterodiegetic narrator. What would be the effect when it is not delivered by YHWH but delivered by the narrator? 1) it shows that God does not need to speak. He is much authoritative! 2) the narrator's statement is more convenient than the character's statement. By doing so, the author can secure the objectivity towards that destruction.

Also, the fact that God and 3rd person narrator tell the fact to the readers, but not to character Ben Adam helps the author in another way. Everybody knows that the executioners did what they were commanded: the city is already destroyed! Unfortunately, since only Ben Adam the character did not know it yet, he becomes the one to start crying out and appealing to YHWH.

More unfortunately, the proleptic desire of the narrator blurted out in the two clauses even before the character starts his action, meaning that Ben Adam's efforts would be useless in the first place. These literary strategies in all stir and provoke very sad and sympathetic emotions for Ben Adam in readers' mind; since only our protagonist Ben Adam did not know the firm decision yet.

In sum, in the first person narrative situation, any new information should be delivered either by the homodiegetic narrator-character or by the quotation of the character. But, here, the author breaks the rule and states nearly impossible statement through the narrator. Indeed, he brought back the 3rd person narrator, i.e., the almost forgotten self-effacing 3rd person narrator in 1:3; and let him say this statement in a very objective, dry, and pithy way which make a stark contrast to the very emotional way of Ben Adam's appeal.

The overall summery of my argument on the proleptic narration by the heterodiegetic narrator is following:

1. At the earliest outset of the narrative: we have a 3rd person unknown narrator who tells about all events in 1:3.

2. Within the narratives, this heterodiegetic narrator yields his work to the homodiegetic narrator-character Ben Adam, which is compatible in its realistic presentations.

3. In the fantastic presentation, the author separates the character Ben Adam from the narrator Ben Adam in order to let the former show what he experiences. So, it was acceptable in most cases. The rule here: both the narrator Ben Adam and the character Ben Adam are to stay in the realm of the experience. Although Ben Adam

197

the character will limit himself to show the experiencing moments in line with the known former experiences in the book (e.g. which I saw in the valley, which I saw in the vision… share and remind the readers frequently to connect to the former vision), but Ben Adam the narrator can show his previous knowledge (e.g., 8:3b which provokes jealousy), both of them are all limited. They cannot transfer the full picture of the event which is happening in a different space.

4. Now, the desire to break the fourth wall, the desire to foretell the unavoidable destiny of Jerusalem has been met! Although it is in vision, the author wants to let the narrator say the historical moment with his mouth as the eyewitness. At the same time, the author wants to let Ben Adam appeal to nullify YHWH's decree by echoing the Abraham scene here. So, the solution is to fetch in the self-effacing narrator of 1:3 and let him say that it is irrevocably determined. It is fulfilled.

4.1.2.2 Divine Execution #2 (10:1-10:22)

A. "And I looked Behold!" [Character's perception] of the theophany   10:1-8
1. A throne figure with cherubim on the expanse   10:1
2. Divine command #3 to the Linen Man   10:2
  a. Divine speech formula   10:2aα
  b. Speech per se: command of the fire destruction   10:2aβ-δ
   ① "Go into the wheels (#3-1)   10:2aβ
   ② "Fill the hands with burning coals (#3-2)   10:2aγ
   ③ "Scatter them over the city" (#3-3)   10:2aδ
  c. Report of the Execution #3-1 by the Linen Man   10:2b
3. [Character's focalization] of the narrative situation
 in execution #3-1&2   10:3-6
  a. Ben Adam's visual witness   10:3-4
   ① Cherubim's standing location: south side house   10:3a

② A cloud as the symbol of the divine presence   10:3b

③ The glory of YHWH to the threshold of the house   10:4

     b. Ben Adam's audio witness   10:5-6

① The sound of wings of the cherubim   10:5

② Voice of God Almighty   10:6

     a) Divine speech formula   10:6a

     b) Speech per se: command #3-2   10:6b

     4. The report of the process of the fire capture (execution #3-2)   10:7-8

     a. A cherub gave the burning coals to the Linen Man   10:7

     b. Description of the cherubim   10:8

B. "And I looked Behold!"

[Character's perception] of the divine throne chariot   10:9-19

     1. Overview of the four wheels beside the cherubim   10:9-14

     a. Moving style of the four wheels   10:9-11

     b. Detailed depictions of the four wheels   10:12-14

① The appearance of the wheels   10:12

② The name of the wheels "the whirling wheels"   10:13

③ Faces of the cherubim   10:14

     2. Relationship between the cherubim and wheels   10:15-17

     a. Connection to the first vision experience   10:15

     b. Moving together wheels and cherubim   10:16-17

     3. Narrating resumed: departure of the glory   10:18-19

     a. Glory's moving out from the threshold   10:18

     b. Accompanied by cherubim (emphasis on eyewitness)   10:19aα

     c. Together with the wheels   10:19aβ

     d. All three entities together mounting up   10:19b

C. Narrator's additional comments, connecting to the first vision   10:20-22

4.1.2.2.1 Structure

The most conspicuous feature of Ezekiel 10 in terms of the structure lies in its interwoven

repetition of two elements: the depiction of the divine manifestation with the cherubim and the

glory as one element and the main storyline of the divine commands and executions to capture the fire from the chariot as the other element. Because much of the narrative space is given to the depictions or explanations of the narrative situation, it is hard to say that the narrative lines have been interrupted by the depiction and have been paused frequently. Rather, the text appears to be intent on retelling the narrative situation, now in a different perspective from the perspective in chapter 9. Thus, Ezekiel 10 looks more like the recounting genre.

With this brief observation, now let us make divisions that are more specific. As mentioned, this unit has two active lines performed by two agents. One is the Linen Man's capturing fire and scattering it out; and the other is the glory of YHWH with the cherubim and the wheels. The first movement, which is the Linen Man scattering the fire, is completed in verse 7. Unlike chapter 9, there is no report on the fulfillment of the divine command. Semiotically, the omission of the report would be understood in the context of the previous chapter. These two active lines also reflect the intention of the text in terms of the present text's formal markers, "וָאֶרְאֶה וְהִנֵּה", in 10:1 and 10:9. According to these two active lines, I set two subsections in this unit: character Ben Adam's perception of the theophany (10:1-8) and his perception of the divine throne chariot (10:9-19).

Now the remaining task is to handle the last three verses, 10:20-22. As I titled this section "narrator's additional comments," my reading put this sub-unit at the same level as the above two sub-units. One may argue that it would belong to the second sub-section, but the reading of discourse analysis provides us the rationale to set the verses as a third sub-unit. First, as the matter of story (what), these three verses cover all the content of the cherubim and wheels which appeared in the beginning of this section. Therefore, it is more appropriate to treat these verses as an independent third section. Second, as the matter of discourse (how), these three verses let the

200

narrator Ben Adam recount what the character Ben Adam experienced both from this first temple vision and from the first vision in Ezekiel 1-3. In terms of the narrative space and time, the implied author shows a similar tendency as that which he showed in Ezekiel 9, i.e., no delay or negotiation in showing the executions of the divine command to destroy the city. To achieve this narrative goal, the author might assign the Linen Man scene to the first part of the chapter, without allowing any interruption of the storyline by descriptions of various unfamiliar heavenly figures. Once the order (v.6) has been commanded, the obedience (v.7) should immediately follow.

Accordingly, as soon as the Linen Man disappears behind the stage in verse 7, the narrative finally assigns the space to identify the cherubim and wheels in connection to the first vision in Ezekiel 1-3. Then, the moving of the cherubim as the accompany of YHWH immediately fills the narrative space. If we consider this chapter only, the story of the Linen Man's capture of the fire seems to serve as a story within the story in the subordinate position. But, when we extend the storyline of this unit up to Ezekiel 9, we find that the execution story and the glory of YHWH's moving story accompanied by the cherubim are interwoven one by one. What is missing in these two stories in Ezekiel 10, unlike in Ezekiel 9, is the lament of Ben Adam concerning YHWH's command of smiting by fire. As we shall see in chapter 11, this scene reappears with a slightly different format in the glory of YHWH's departure. This observation suggests that we should see the three chapters, 9, 10, and 11, together in light of the divine judgment execution scene. For the convenience of discussion, I will include the structural overview of chapter 11 here. There is progression in the story line through the three chapters, but the story line does not follow the linear timeline. Rather, it is moving with the forward movement of a spiral arrow.

Ch. 9	Ch. 10	Ch. 11
Execution (weapon: no witness)	(Fire: no witness)	Execution like death (witness)
Lament (from only hearing the disaster)	n/a	Lament (from the experience) Glory
(as an introductory)	Glory (dominant)	Glory (as a closing scene)

This table informs us that Ezekiel 9 functions as an overview of the execution scene that it contains all three elements—execution, lament, and YHWH's glory—in balance. Informed by a heterodiegetic narrator in a manner of the voice-over narration, as I argued, Ben Adam the character lamented to YHWH, the ultimate judge. In comparison, Ezekiel 10 shows that no human being's appeal is available in the execution scene. The narrator leads readers to imagine the fiery destruction in the city Jerusalem, but does not provide the direct scene for the eyewitness report. Therefore, Ben Adam cannot be an eyewitness of the moment of the city's destruction. In Ezekiel 9 and 10, we do not have the eyewitness scene of the fall of Jerusalem, but with several other factors, we can assume that the fall happened.

Here, the movement or progress of the time and event is expressed by the glory of YHWH's location. In chapter 9, the glory of YHWH, which is supposed to be in the holy of holies, now comes out to the inner court of the temple. That makes readers uneasy with the memory of the judgment of YHWH in Ezekiel 8:17-18. If the readers are intelligible enough to remember the glory of YHWH scene in the Pentateuch after the judgement was announced, this appearance of the glory makes readers conjecture that the impending execution is approaching.

In Ezekiel 10, the glory is now mounting up more and more with the solemn authority with his company. There is only one last thing to do before the departure of the city which was unfortunately to be annihilated with fire, just as he once annihilated Sodom and Gomorrah.

Ezekiel 11 then emphasizes the eyewitness senses and functions as a confirmation or the explanation of the vision. It is very similar to the two-fold presentations in Ezekiel 37:1-14 in terms of the structure. As though the dry bone vision has the vision itself (37:1-10) and its explanation (37:11-14), Ezekiel 9-11 consists of the execution itself (chs. 9-10) and the explanation (ch. 11).

"And I looked Behold!" [Character's perception] of the theophany (10:1-8)

Ezekiel 10:1 begins quite abruptly with a description of the divine throne above the platform. However, this theme is then immediately replaced by the depiction of the cherubim. In the overall intention of Ezekiel 10, the main theme of the moving of the glory is delayed until the execution of the fiery destruction will be set up. The image of a rain of fire from the heaven into the city is, with other elements, well-matched with Genesis 19:24, which describes the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

In this section, MT and LXX show different ways of the Linen Man's fire catching.

According to the LXX 10:7, the Linen Man himself catches the coals, but the MT text reports that it is a cherub who gave the fire to the Linen Man. Zimmerli evaluates that the MT is probably a gloss inspired by Isaiah 6:6.[367] Cooke also points out that the LXX shows more direct obedience to the divine command.[368] However, this discrepancy shown in the MT can be understood in terms of Ezekiel 8-11's penchant for the repetitive presentation. If 10:2 tells about the overall command and fulfillment of the fire capture, 10:6-8 recounts the same scene in detail.

---

[367] Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 231-33.More on the compositional history discussions, see Cornelius B. Houk, "The Final Redaction of Ezekiel 10," *JBL* 90 (1971): 42-54. David Halperin, "Exegetical Character of Ezek X," *VT* 26, no. 2 (1975): 129.

[368] Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 115

This gradual or repetitive representation appears almost every account in the book of Ezekiel so that we can even note that this gradual revelation is one of the trademarks of the book of Ezekiel. As Zimmerli points out,[369] the peculiar term אוֹפַנִּים in v. 13 for גַּלְגַּל (wheel) in vv. 2 and 6 is one example of the gradual revelation since the same entity, wheel, appeared in chapter 1 as the unknown entity.

As shown in the table above and the structure of the unit, neither the telling of the report nor the showing of the scene regarding the destruction of the city is provided in this scene. The narrator intentionally avoids the scene of destruction and delays until this fulfillment as the very brief report in chapter 33. Instead of showing a detailed report, the narrator now connects the two scenes (the chapter 11 vision with the chapter 1 vision).

"And I looked Behold!" [Character's perception] of the divine throne chariot (10:9-19)

In this section, we have textual and redactional seams in verse 14. Pointing out that LXX omits the whole verse 10:14, Hiebel argues that MT 10:14 takes a free paraphrasing work instead of harmonizing with the rest of Ezekiel 10 and Ezekiel 1.[370] The crucial difference lies in the change of the cow figure in 1:10 to the cherub figure in chapter 10:14. I also see the seam or discrepancy between the two accounts, but we do not need to consider the two figures as two different entities. First, the text does not support different understanding but clearly shows its intention for us to connect this scene in Ezekiel 10 with the first vision in Ezekiel 1. Second, based on the mysterious or less known figure "cherub," we may conjecture that the expression of

---

[369] Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 232.

[370] Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives*, 96. She also listed the several scholars' agreement on her evaluation.

"cow"-like face in 1:10 is now understood by Ben Adam in vision as a cherub-like face. The

point is that this textual critical observation in this verse is not strong enough to change the

structure of the text.

When the story line reaches verse 18, the glory crosses the threshold of the house. This is

a very significant expression in term of the two meanings. First, this is a continuation or

resumption account from chapter 9 in which the glory of YHWH appears in the inner court of the

temple, not in the holy of holies. In other words, the court of the judgment and its proclamation

place should be outside of the holy of holies and even outside the holy place. Although it would

be soon abandoned by its deity, the two most holy places are to still be protected in the eyes of

the priestly-oriented author of the book. Second, this scene is one of the few scenes in which

YHWH shows himself to the public, though here also he appears in the form of the glory and in

the vision. This time, the departure of the glory of God from the temple is performed not by the

command and execution form, but rather in silence. The departure is more like the ritual. This

somewhat peculiar execution is the climax of the expression of God's anger against the temple.

Here, the two vehicles, the narrative action line and the description of the glory of YHWH, meet

in one scene. That is why this departure should be interpreted as the peak execution of his wrath.

[Narrator's additional comments, connecting to the first vision] (10:20-22)

Although several scholars have focused on the diachronic issues of this additional

comment and treated it as a separate unit,[371] the synchronic reading with the consideration of its

performative nature would provide a more understandable picture. To understand this, first we

need to be aware that this unit belongs to the vision account, not the vision itself. Vision account

---

[371] Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives*, 290.

means that it is told by someone who claims that he experienced the vision. Our starting point is that because it is an account we can read this text as a narrative discourse. In other words, Ezekiel 8-11 is a written presentation of the ancient time, which suggests the innumerable oral presentations with this text. It is equally possible in the case of the book of Ezekiel that the compositional history would tell that either the written text has adopted the oral traditions or the oral traditions were transcribed into a present written form.[372] The point is that, in these three last verses of Ezekiel 10, we experience the switch of the camera position (or more precisely with the narratology term, focalization) from the video-like descriptive scene of the character Ben Adam to the narrator Ben Adam who now looks at his audience in his recounting.

4.1.2.2.2 Genres and Languages

[The Glory of the God of Israel versus the Glory of YHWH]

Throughout Ezek. 8-11 two different terminologies regarding the glory of the deity occur: כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה (10:4ac, 18a, 11:23a) and כְּבוֹד אֱלֹהֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל (8:4a; 9:3a; 10:19e; 11:22c). Frank-Lothar Hossfeld used these terms as a criterion for separating editorial layers,[373] but as Behrens points out, Hossfeld's application of the redactional layers seems too narrow since the two terms appear interchangeable, especially in depiction of the departure of the glory.[374]

An interesting point is that the term "glory of the God of Israel" is a unique term of the

---

[372] Nili Shupak, "'Eat This Scroll' (Ezekiel 3:1): Writing as Symbol and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Sources," *BiOr* 70 (2013): 26-42; Claudia V. Camp, "Oralities, Literacies, and Colonialisms in Antiquity and Contemporary Scholarship" in *Orality, Literacy, and Colonialism in Antiquity,* ed. Jonathan A. Draper, Semeia Studies 47 (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2004) 193-217; David M. Carr, "Torah on the Heart: Literary Jewish Textuality within Its Ancient Near Eastern Context," *Oral Tradition* 25 (2010): 17-39.

[373] Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, "Die Tempelvision Ez 8-11 im Licht unterschiedlicher methodischer Zugänge," in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and their Interrelation*, 160-62.

[374] Behrens, *Prophetische Visionsschilderungen*, 219.

book of Ezekiel, i.e., appears only in this book throughout the Hebrew Bible. Moreover, out of five times of occurrence, four times are employed here; with the fifth appearance in 43:2, a clear case that matches with the departure of the glory in ch. 10. Hiebel attributes all four examples of the verse to the redactional works.[375] I am more interested in the intention of the final redactor, if we need to admit the touches of the redactors, from which I saw the effort to make some coherence in one important thematic motif, i.e., departure of the glory. The glory of the God of Israel, which emphasizes the nationality of the deity, is now moving from Jerusalem, a city that was sacred for a long time because of YHWH's sanctuary. As this present study focuses on this movement, the term "glory of the God of Israel" gives a thematic unity to the departure and return of the glory. More importantly, distinct from the glory of YHWH, which is popular in other priestly writings,[376] this term "glory of the God of Israel" gives a rationale to the *golah* community, more precisely, the Jehoiachin exilic community, who claims that they bear this glory during the exilic time.

4.1.2.2.3 Settings

Several historical settings can be conjectured from the help of the ANE sources. First, by mentioning the Babylonian name, "Chaber canal," which appeared in the first vision, Ezekiel 10:15 explicitly connects Ben Adam's witness in the Jerusalem temple to the former vision experience. Babylonian sources mention two canals called Kabaru, one in the vicinity of Nippur and the other perhaps in the Babylon-Borsippa region.[377] Another connecting word for the

---

[375] Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives*, 110.

[376] As Hiebel lists (*Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives,* 110), the term "the glory of YHWH" occurs 37 times throughout the Hebrew Bible, of which at least twelve are in P.

[377] David S. Vanderhooft, "Chebar," *EBR* 5 (2012): 46. One Babylonian text mentions even the place name Al-Nar-Kabari (Joannès and Lemaire, "Contrats babyloniens d'époque

historical setting would be related to the "enemy-from-the-north" tradition and the "great-shaking" motif. The former already appeared in 8:3 (north gate) and 9:2 (from the north). The latter is more related to the divine manifestation of YHWH and, in our case, to the cherubim's movement in chapter 10.

4.2 Second "The Spirit Lifted Me Up": from the inner court to the east gate (11:1-11:23)

Ezekiel 11 is more of a combination of elements in chapters 8, 9, and 10. The presentation is more like a review and recounting of Ben Adam's journey to the Jerusalem temple, from the beginning to the end, from a slightly different perspective and mode.

4.2.1 Fifth "It brought me": to the entrance of the eastern gateway (11:1-11:13)

Twenty-five men: Fifth "It brought me": to the entrance of the eastern gateway 11:1-11:13

A. Arrival at the east gate	11:1a
B. The twenty five men	11:1b-11:13
① [character's focalization] of Jaazaniah and Pelatiah	11:1bα
② Narrator's comment: they are the leaders of the people	11:1bβ
③ YHWH's comment	11:2-4
a) Speech formula	11:2a
b) Speech per se	11:2b-4
i. Accusation	11:2bα-3
1. Evaluation: the wicked counselor	11:2bα-bβ
2. Reason: their sayings	11:3
a. The reconstruction time (building the house) is far	11:3a
b. The city will protect us (cauldron and meat analogy)	11:3b
ii. Punishment in the form of divine command to prophesy against them	11:4
④ Narrator's report: the empowerment of the Spirit upon the prophet	11:5a
⑤ Divine command resumed	11:5b-12

achéménide," text 7:5). If Ezek. 3:15 is of later origin, the place name could reflect the existence of Judean settlements in that area.

a) Speech formula $11:5b\alpha^{1-3}$
b) Speech per se $11:5b\alpha^{4}$-12
  i. Command for the prophetic speech $11:5b\alpha^{4-7}$
  ii. Prophetic speech formula $11:5b\alpha^{8-9}$
  iii. Prophetic speech per se: rhetoric of inversion $11:5b\alpha^{10}$-11:10
    1. Consider your sayings since I know your mind $11:5b\alpha^{10-12}$
    a. Accusation: Restatement of the bloody city   11:6
    b. Punishment: "You will be brought out of the city" 11:7-10
    i. Divine speech formula within the speech   11:7a
    ii. Divine speech per se   11:7b-10
     A. Using the same topics which the audience used 11:7b-9
    c. Result: recognition formula (You will know..)   11:10
    i. Repetition of the analogy (cauldron and meat)   11:11a
    ii. Judge the audience at the border   11:11b
    iii. Result: recognition formula (You will know…) 11:12a
    iv. Reason of all punishment:

     not following the status but follow the nations   11:12b
⑥ Narrator's report:
  Pelatiah's sudden death during the prophecy   11:13a
⑦ Character's lament to God   11:13b
  a) Action $11:13b\alpha$
  b) Speech $11:13b\beta$
   i. Speech formula $11:13b\beta^{1}$
   ii. Speech per se: using the name "Pelatiah"[378] $11:13b\beta^{2}$

4.2.1.1 Structure

Although there would not be a significant physical distance between the inner-court of

the temple in Ezekiel 10 to the east gate of the temple, the text expresses this exact phrase of "the

Spirit lifted me and brought me" like the first part of the vision in 8:3b. This phrase sets chapter

11, as the same narrative structural level, as another version of this temple vision. Not only are

these two clauses are identical, but also the description of the gate has the same syntactic

structure as the first move in 8:3b, i.e., both descriptions use the "which" clause in describing the

---

[378] Note for no pre-warning from God before his death and no answer from God after the appeal. The divine determination is clearly firm and the divine speech has the power.

gate one more time. According to 11:1b, the spot where Ben Adam arrived is the entrance of the gateway, like Ben Adam's arrival in the entrance of the northern gateway in 8:3b.

As we shall see, this unit has several similarities and differences with the temple tour in chapter 8. Apparently, therefore, chapter 8 and chapter 11 look like the outer sandwich which embrace the execution and the glory scenes in chapters 9-10, but the sandwich structure or *inclusio* should not be the conclusion since the focus of Ezekiel 11 is different from Ezekiel 8. If the tour in chapter 8 focuses on informing Ben Adam (and his audience), in this latter unit, after the perception of the divine execution, the tour concentrates on the specific person or group and the commission of the prophecy. In chapter 11, the representativeness becomes stronger. Ben Adam stands as the representative of the elders of Judah in Chaldea, who are sitting at Ben Adam's house during his vision tour. In comparison, Pelatiah the son of Benaiah represents the elders of Jerusalem, those who stay in Jerusalem and make a wicked counsel. His name, Pelatiah, etymologically reminds of the fugitive (הַפָּלֵיט in Ezek. 33:21) who reports the fall of Jerusalem. Zimmerli interprets the name Pelatiah (פלטיהו) as "Yahweh causes a remnant to escape" as expressed in 14:22 (פְּלֵטָה).[379] The dramatic presentation of the death of Pelatiah would be shocking to both character Ben Adam and his literary audience. Within this framework, YHWH has Ben Adam continue to prophesy concerning the two radically different destinies of the Jerusalemites and the *golah* community.

In making the structure of Ezekiel 11 and more broadly of Ezekiel 8-11, the formal marker "The Spirit lifted me up" in 11:1 draws our attention. The issue comes from the diachronic questions. Zimmerli, Allen, John Wevers, Joyce, and others have argued 11:1-21

---

[379] Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 257.

must be not an original part of the vision,[380] while Pohlman suggests it might be the oldest part as a *golah*-oriented text.[381] Regardless of scholars' conclusions, the two sub-units of Ezekiel 11 (Ezekiel 11:1-13 or 11:1-21) constantly draw interpreters' attention by showing the seams or tension of the text. Hiebel summarizes the criteria of the redactional signs from the recognition of various seams of the text. Her first argument lies in the temporal discrepancy between 11:1 and the divine command in 9:5-7, i.e., how could it be possible that the twenty-five "wicked" survivors still are standing in the temple precinct after the annihilation of the divine command from the temple? Her second argument goes on the different functions of "the Spirit lifted me up" sentence in this verse from the beginning and ending of the vision. In the latter's case, the Spirit plays the role of supernatural transportation between Jerusalem and Babylon, but in the former's case, according to Hiebel, the supernatural transportation is not necessary because Ben Adam's movement is walkable as shown in chapter 8. The last point is the prophecy of killing the remnants at the border of Israel in 11:10-11 must be nonsense because of the complete destruction command and fulfillment in chs. 9-10.[382] These arguments are mostly related to the temporal nonsense from the sequential and lineal reading of the text.

My interest, however, focuses more on the rationale of the final redactor's choice. Above all, what made the redactor choose to insert this conspicuous formula "Spirit lifted me up" in the middle of the journey, despite all the unnatural narrative conditions that Hiebel summarized? In other words, he could decide not to use the repeated sentence "the Spirit lifted me up" when he worked on the final touch on the text, but he used it. Why? Using this explicit driving key phrase

---

[380] Zimmerlie, *Ezekiel 1*, 230-31; John W. Wevers, *Ezekiel*, NCB (London: Nelson, 1969), 92, 95; Allen, *Ezekiel 1-19*, 131; Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 108.

[381] Pohlmann, *Hesekiel 1-19*, 128-37, 158-65.

[382] Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives*, 99-100.

as the head of Ezekiel 11, what did he want to show? At this point, Sweeney's analogy would be

helpful to understanding the different agenda between the original author group and the final

redactor group:

> The actant and the receiver correspond to the distinction between the intentions of
> an author and the understanding and subsequent interpretation of a redactor who
> redefines the meaning of the earlier text and places it into a new textual setting.[383]

We do not have any editorial note before us; therefore, all we can do is let our educated

conjecture work. Apparently, this reconstruction looks very subjective; nonetheless, it would be

indeed the same degree of subjectivity that the diachronic interpreters do. Moreover, this

reconstruction would give us a benefit, too, since during this pondering, we would consider to

what degree we would allow that this redactional layer affects the structure of the text. Rolf

Knierim advises to respect the final form of the text even if interpreters find clear redactional

rework on the original composition.[384] How much shall we be faithful to Knierim's direction?

Instead of disregarding Knierim's advice, can we make multiple structures on one text? Why

should we be satisfied with one structure, if the text itself contains multiple layers of history and

shows a lack of concern for the only correct structure?

The detailed discussion will be unpacked in Chapter 6 Structures of Ezekiel 8-11, since

the final decision in positioning of the ultimate formal marker like "The Spirit Lifted Me Up"

should be made in the context of all four chapters with the consideration of both formal and

thematic features together. Here, I would like to make sure that the sentence "The Spirit lifted me

up" should work as the most front macro sign of the formal structure (the most left line in the

---

[383] Sweeney, "Form criticism," 66.

[384] Cf. Deborah L. Ellens, Michael H. Floyd, Wonil Kim, and Marvin A. Sweeney, eds., *Reading the Hebrew Bible for a New Millennium: Form, Concept, and Theological Perspective*, vol. 2, Studies in Antiquity & Christianity (Place of Publication: Publisher, 2001), 154; Knierim, *Text and Concept in Leviticus 1:1-9.*

diagram of the structure in the vision 8:3b-11:24). I have reflected on this decision as we see in the structure of the present study: 4.1 First "The Spirit Lifted Me Up" (8:3b-10:22); 4.2 Second "The Spirit Lifted Me Up" (11:1-11:23); and 4.3 Third "Spirit Lifted Me Up" (11:24). Likewise, the clause "It brought me" should work as the second left line in the formal structure of the vision. Thus, "The Spirit lifted me up" in 11:1 becomes a Second Lift and "It brought me" becomes a Fifth "Brought me."

4.2.1.2 Genres and Languages

As I mentioned above, the eclectic combination of Ezekiel 11 shows various genres within it. The first obvious and framing genre is the vision tour. Up to the sudden death of Pelatiah in v.13, the pattern of this unit resembles the temple tour in chapter 8.[385] Because the author uses the same pattern of the previous unit, and makes his readers somewhat relaxed in the familiar pattern, the collapse of Pelatiah without any pre-warning gives more shock to the readers. As Johannes Lindblom points out, the graphic presentation of Pelatiah's death makes the first temple vision more dramatic.[386] I would also pay more attention to the manner of presentation in two points: the intention and implication of vivid showing on Pelatiah's death; the implicit intention of Ben Adam's involvement on his death.

Regarding the first point, I consult with the metaphorical interpretation of Pelatiah and his death, rather than the dominant diachronic approaches in this verse. As mentioned in the

---

[385] The similar pattern in my reading, however, is different from Hiebel's reading. For her, 11:1 is "a combination of 8:3 (transport by spirit to a gate) with the location from 10:19 (east gate) and reminiscences to 8:11, 16." Hiebel also attributes Ben Adam's cry to the duplication of the lament in 9:8. Although the observations made by Hiebel and me appear similar, the ultimate interpretations look different. Hiebel, *Interrelated Visions*, 100.

[386] Johannes Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962), 160-75.

Structure section,[387] in the eyes of diachronic scholars including Fohrer and Galling, 11:13—

which shows the sudden death of Pelatiah—is regarded as the later addition.[388] Even admitting

the diachronic seams of the verse, however, we can appreciate the intention of the text as it is.

For example, I suggest reading the presentation of the death as a synecdoche, a figure of speech

to express the whole picture by showing the representative part of the whole. As we have seen in

Zimmmerli's comment, the name Pelatiah itself contains the meaning of the "fugitive," which

could save his life by escaping from the wrath of YHWH for a while. From the expression of

Ben Adam in his lament which he interprets Pelatiah as the representative of the remnant,

Pelatiah's name gets the meaning of "remnant," too. Thus, Pelatiah's death symbolizes the

complete death of the remnants of Jerusalemites. This synecdochical application in fact is not

limited to Pelatiah's death, but can often be found in Ben Adam's generic characterization as the

potential reader. As mentioned, Ben Adam, with the meaning of any human being, represents the

ideal exilic audience.

The second point is the role of Ben Adam in Pelatiah's death as related to the prophecy-

fulfilment or sign-act scene. According to the psycholinguistic analyst, David Crystal,

illocutionary acts refer to the performance of the speaker which is fulfilled in the virtual world.

His examples include promise, command, request, or arrest.[389] A series of the commands of

YHWH to Ben Adam, his obedience to prophecy, and the death of Pelatiah as the evidence of the

fulfillment in Ezekiel 11 perfectly fit in this illocutionary act category. According to Davis'

---

[387] One of the reasons for this conjecture was because of the incompatible logic with
previous chapters, i.e., the existence of wicked survivors even after the report of the complete
annihilation.

[388] Fohrer and Galling, *Ezechiel*, 58.

[389] David Crystal, *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 5th edition (Oxford:
Blackwell, 2003), 226.

argument, "illocutionary force cannot always be determined on the basis of semantic or grammatical markers; one must know also something of the context of speaking, including the power relation between addresser and addressee."[390] Her emphasis on the context and power dynamics between the actant and the receiver lead us to think of the two contrastive parties during the exilic times: the Jerusalemites and the Jehojachin exiles. Therefore, the logic of Pelatiah as the representative of the Jerusalemites is reasonable. If we see his death and Ben Adam's prophecy in this context, we find a somewhat grave and scary claim in this unit. First of all, we need to admit that the presentation of the vision implicitly prompts us to think that there is an invisible or transparent glass between the observed people in the Jerusalem temple and the observer Ben Adam, like Foucault's penopticon setting. As Foucault imagines in his prison system, the accessibility between the observed and the observers is unfair in that not only the former cannot listen to what the observers say, but also the former cannot even recognize that they are being observed because the observers are not visible to them.[391] Of course, we need to modify this setting in the application to Ezekiel 8-11. In our text, this transparent penopticon-like glass works symbolically as the stone heart of the sinners in Jerusalem, appeared in 11:19. This stone heart in the Jerusalemites hinders them from listening to YHWH's message, and without recognition of any pre-warning, their lives would suddenly end as that collapse happened to Pelatiah. God's removal of the stone heart from the people when he returns the people to the Land in 11:19 would be naturally connected to this concept. But, the people whom YHWH cares from and remove the heart of stone from are not Jerusalemites but the *golah* community. This *golah*-oriented tendency leads us to think about the second point of perlocutionary power

---

[390] Davis, *Swallowing the Scroll,* 119.

[391] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison,* trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1995).

dynamics. From the perspective of the Jehojachin *golah* community, this scene can be understood as the same context of the siege of the miniature of Jerusalem in Ezekiel 4:1-3. In other words, Jerusalem, once objectivized and decentered in Ezekiel 4, now becomes the object of the divine punishment.

Back to our discussion for genre study, the third genre that we find in this unit would be the disputation, which appeared also in Ezekiel 8 and 9. In 11:5-7, another judgment announcement is claimed within the judgment prophecy. Through this form of "disputation," YHWH indeed educates Ben Adam and the implied audience through Ben Adam, the representative of the ideal audience. Although I follow the traditional category of the genre,[392] the opposite partner of YHWH in this unit is not Ben Adam but the implied audience and the character who cannot communicate with YHWH. This one-way speech creates a serious communication issue in Ezekiel 8-11 as well as in the book of Ezekiel. As I mentioned in Introduction, interaction between the deity and human beings, or the possible change of the destiny as the fruit of interaction appears already to have disappeared from the mind of the author. If this unit employs the court language, that court must have a very authoritative or even arbitrary setting in that the defenders cannot apologize for their case.

Lastly, this unit contains Ben Adam's lament in front of Pelatiah's sudden death. We already saw Ben Adam's outcry concerning YHWH's complete destruction of the house of Israel. Although this outcry is similar enough to remind us of the lament in chapter 9, the two narrative situations show at least two differences. First, Ben Adam's reaction in chapter 9 was performed when he saw the preparation such as the executioners' coming with the weapon, YHWH's

---

[392] Cf. Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39,* 512-47; Adrian Graffy, *A Prophet Confronts His People: The Disputation Speech in the Prophets,* AnBib 104 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1984), esp. 42-52.

solemn command, and seven men's immediate obedience. But in chapter 11, Ben Adam reacted to what was happening before him. Ironically and tragically enough, now the agent becomes Ben Adam himself because he is the one who proclaimed it. Fourth, lament. Another important difference of the lament in this unit lies its structural function in a larger context. This is a pragmatic concern in a Schweizer's term that how the speech affects to the characters and audiences. The lament in chapter 9 gives YHWH a chance to perform the accusation and judgment, i.e., justification of YHWH's punishment. In comparison, the lament in chapter 11 makes the transition of the story from the judgment to the salvation. We should notice however that the object of the salvation oracle is not the group in which one person has just died. In this context, the two laments in Ezekiel 9 and 11 are indeed connected to support the choice of the *golah* community card.

4.2.1.3 Settings

In consulting the possible historical setting, we see some possible intertextuality between this unit and Jeremiah 29, not as a citation, echo, or allusion, but as a possible subsequent story. Indeed, the book of Ezekiel shares many parallels with the book of Jeremiah, mostly with the direction from Jeremiah to Ezekiel. If the consolation to the Jehoiachin exiles is the aim of this divine command, Ezekiel 11 can be read as the candidate of the letter of Jeremiah to the exile in Jeremiah 29. Although authorial and textual intertextuality cannot be claimed, the same thematic intention of the text makes the probable basis for this readerial intertextuality.[393]

In the social setting, as we observed in Genres and Languages, prophetic performance is integrated in the vision format. In chapter 8, Ben Adam was an observer, and in chapter 9, he saw how the heavenly executioners, as heavenly priests, work. In chapter 11, this unit, he was

---

[393] Cf. W. L. Holladay, "Had Ezekiel Known Jeremiah Personally?" *CBQ* 63 (2001): 31-34.

finally surprised that his word (not exactly prophecy; rather it is the priestly proclamation as "impurity") gets the actual power to kill a person. Zimmerli sees this series of condemnation elements of Decalogue as which we read in Hosea or Jeremiah, and connects this unit to the holiness code influence.[394]

Meanwhile, Strine finds a political setting in Ezekiel 11. Strine first distinguishes two kinds of polemic or resistance: polemic against the Jerusalemites as an open polemic and resistance against the Neo-Babylonian power as a hidden or disguised polemic. By practicing two kinds of polemic, Strine argues, the book of Ezekiel shows how to become exemplar of the faithful YHWH believer.[395] His argument gives important insight for my spatial analysis, too, in that I also read that the book of Ezekiel makes the two kinds of heterotopia under the Babylonian exile.

4.2.2 Narrator's report on the Divine salvation speech (11:14-21)

Narrator's report on the Divine salvation speech	11:14-21
a) The word of YHWH: speech formula	11:14
b) Speech per se	11:15-21a
i. Fear factors: Quotation of the sayings of Jerusalemites	11:15
1. Quotation formula	11:15a
2. Quotation per se: Land is ours	11:15b
ii. Salvation:	11:16
1. Command of the prophetic speech to the exiles	11:16
2. Divine prophetic speech formula	11:16a
3. Salvation Prophetic speech per se #1	11:16aα-b
1) Present condition: being scattered	11:16a
2) I will be a sanctuary there	11:16b
iii. Salvation Prophetic Speech per se #2	11:17-21a

---

[394] Zimmerli, "Form- and Traditio-Historical Character of Ezekiel," 519.

[395] Casey A. Strine, *Sworn Enemies: The Divine Oath, the Book of Ezekiel, and the Polemics of Exile,* BZAW 436 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 134.

1.	Command of the prophetic speech	11:17aα
2.	Divine prophetic speech formula	11:17aβ-b
3.	I will gather you	11:17aβ
4.	I will give you the land of Israel	11:17b
5.	They shall come there	11:18a
6.	They will remove abominations in the land	11:18b
7.	I will transform them	11:19
8.	They will walk in my statues	11:20
9.	New relationship between me and them	11:20
10.	Conditional salvation: exclusion of the some group	11:21a

c)	Closing divine speech formula	11:21b

4.2.2.1 Structure

Demarcations of this unit seem clear since it starts with the word-event formula in 11:14 and ends with the utterance formula in 11:21b. As above, the structure diagram shows its perfect form of the salvation oracle for the Babylonian exiles as the implied audience. The issue in reading this unit, therefore, rather comes from the literary contexts of this unit, a question of how to connect this unit with the previous dramatic vision unit (11:1-13) as well as with the whole structure of Ezekiel 8-11. Zimmerli already pointed out the lack of visionary aspect of this unit as the noticeable shift from the visionary context to the prophetic world.[396] Although I agree with him on this regard, I would suggest that the vision of Ezekiel 8-11 might be composed for this didactic purpose toward the first target audience of the *golah* community as well as for the polemic purpose against the second target audience of the Jerusalemites. In other words, although this unit adopts the prophetic salvation formula, and therefore does not present a wonderful salvation, redemption, or restoration picture in the visionary language, the thematic connections are still very relevant to the Ezekiel 8-11 context. Indeed, this reservation of the visionary presentation of the salvation scene in this first temple vision comes from a strong compositional strategy that the salvation picture should be reserved until the story reaches a

---

[396] Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1*, 260.

certain point: the land of Israel should be purged; the returning people should be ready with the new heart and new spirit; the new temple has been built in a right spot in the land of Israel; and finally the glory of YHWH will return. The intention of the structure is clear that the first temple vision focuses to *show* the reason and the process of YHWH's moving his sanctuary from the Jerusalem temple. The salvation related presentation, therefore, should not come to the forefront in this vision. If we consider this context, the salvation oracle concerning the *golah* community (11:14-21) is a kind of excurse, a later-inserted text as the diachronic scholars assert. Nonetheless, if we consider the whole picture of Ezekiel 8-11, especially its didactic aim, the salvation oracle—both the content and its form—seems reasonably positioned after the presentation of the death of the last representative person.

It is hard to agree to Zimmerli's comment that the tension between the two parties did not show until this unit. The distinction between the two parties is prevailing throughout the so-called Judgment part of the book of Ezekiel (chs. 1-39). Ezekiel 4, the command of the didactic performance to show the siege of Jerusalem, is one example, and the subsequent prophecies to proclaim the end of the house of Israel (as Jerusalemites) in 5-7 is another example. Rom-Shiloni also argues that the book of Ezekiel is framed with these two-party relations. As she correctly interprets, the "otherness" for the author of the book of Ezekiel lies in the Jehoiachin exiles' exclusion of the Jerusalemites in reshaping the genuine house of Israel. [397]

In the syntactic and semantic analyses, we see several issues in this unit. Among them, two topics should be discussed for the understanding of the text in Structure section: 1) semantic understanding of the shift of pronouns "you" and "they" in referring the same party, the *golah*

---

[397] Rom-Shiloni, "Jerusalem and Israel, Synonyms or Antonyms?," 113.

community in 11:18; 2) rhetorical intention of the diverse temporal aspects in 11:21 to figure out the identity of "those whose heart goes after their detestable things and their abominations."

Let us begin with the first topic, the semantic understanding of the shift of pronouns "you" and "they" in referring the same party, the *golah* community.

Up to v.16, the second person pronoun "you" in the divine speech from 11:14 refers to only Ben Adam as the literary addressee in the vision. Both the Jerusalemites and the *golah* community exiles are expressed "they" as distant objects. But in v.17, as we shall see below, YHWH changes his performative tone to a more directive mode. Interestingly syntax of verse 16a and of verse 17a is the same: [conjunction + divine command verb + divine speech formula + directed speech within YHWH's speech as subject "I" as I highlighted]. If the narrative situation of v.17 remains as same as its previous verse except the change of addressee, that change should need our attention.

לָכֵן אֱמֹר כֹּה־אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה כִּי הִרְחַקְתִּים בַּגּוֹיִם וְכִי הֲפִיצוֹתִים בָּאֲרָצוֹת וָאֱהִי לָהֶם לְמִקְדָּשׁ מְעַט בָּאֲרָצוֹת אֲשֶׁר־בָּאוּ שָׁם: ס
(11:16)

לָכֵן אֱמֹר כֹּה־אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה וְקִבַּצְתִּי אֶתְכֶם מִן־הָעַמִּים וְאָסַפְתִּי אֶתְכֶם מִן־הָאֲרָצוֹת אֲשֶׁר נְפֹצוֹתֶם בָּהֶם וְנָתַתִּי לָכֶם אֶת־אַדְמַת יִשְׂרָאֵל:
(11:17)

Noting that the Greek translation keeps the third person pronoun even in v.17, Greenberg argues that this sudden change of the pronoun reflects the presence of the *golah* community as the literary audience.[398] His argument seems reasonable, but still stays at the abstract level. Moreover, the change of the pronoun of the addresses in speech does not always become a condition of the change of the actual addressee. It can be a reflection of the change of the presentation mode. Therefore, we need more research for this phenomenon. At first glance, the

---

[398] Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 190.

divine command in v.16 with the second level of addressee "them" presupposes Ben Adam, the first level of addressee, paraphrasing the content of the divine speech in his deliverance. On the contrary, in v.17, YHWH or the author through the divine speech perceives that the content of verse 17 should be delivered in a verbatim manner to the second level of addressee, the *golah* community.

From this observation, we readers recognize that the matter of the return to the soil of Israel in v.17 might be a more important issue for Ben Adam's literary audience in Chaldea than the issue of their living situation with YHWH in Chaldea as addressed in v. 16. This "you" pronoun in v.17 also suggests that we conjecture the implied inquiry of the elders of Judah in 8:1 to be more related to the matter of their return than to the matter of YHWH's movement to them through forsaking the Jerusalemites. Even if the audience's interests must be in the issue of the possibility of the swift returning, as a reader of the book of Ezekiel as whole, I surely acknowledge that the leitmotif of the book of Ezekiel lies in pursuing the meaning of exile rather than in asking for the return to the land. Even from this surface level of synchronic investigations, we recognize that this unique expression is too significant to conclude as a secondary insertion due to the different verbal forms from the immediate contexts.[399]

My synchronic and diachronic study on 11:17 finds more meanings on this and can be summarized with four points. First of all, this "you" referring to the *golah* community in v.17 is the direct response of YHWH to the first pronoun "for us" in the quoted direct speech of Jerusalemites in v.15. Comparison between the two verses will help our understanding.

---

[399] For example, based on the use of verbal forms in 11:17, Eichrodt and Hossfeld excluded verse 17 from the original disputation setting. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 111; Hossfeld, "Die Tempelvision Ez 8-11," 155.

בֶּן־אָדָם אַחֶיךָ אַחֶיךָ אַנְשֵׁי גְאֻלָּתֶךָ וְכָל־בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל כֻּלֹּה אֲשֶׁר אָמְרוּ לָהֶם יֹשְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלַ͏ִם רַחֲקוּ מֵעַל יְהֹוָה לָנוּ הִיא נִתְּנָה הָאָרֶץ לְמוֹרָשָׁה: ס

(11:15)

If YHWH's becoming a temporary sanctuary for them in v.16 is a direct response to the

imperative "far away from YHWH" (רַחֲקוּ מֵעַל יְהֹוָה) in v. 15, their quoted speech stirs YHWH's

anger to the extent that YHWH even changes his speech style from maintaining distance with the

second level of audience, the *golah* community, in order to approach them. In v.15, YHWH

quotes Jerusalemites' saying, "To us, the land is given as inheritance" (לָנוּ הִיא נִתְּנָה הָאָרֶץלְמוֹרָשָׁה).

Now, let us read again YHWH's saying in v.17b (וְנָתַתִּי לָכֶם אֶת־אַדְמַת יִשְׂרָאֵל). The first

impression in the comparison would be "to us" versus "to you." Because they said "to us,"

YHWH's response should be on the same level of the directness as its counterpart. The

Jerusalemites' sayings and deeds are provocative enough for YHWH to react very seriously. As

such, Jerusalemites are so wicked and the representative of these Jerusalemites was Pelatiah in

11:1-13. Here is the reason of the direct speech using the appointed addressee "you."

Meanwhile, closer reading shows subtle differences between the two claims. While

Jerusalemites in v.15 express the possession of the land in a passive way, i.e., the agent is not

certain, YHWH clearly expresses with his strong will to grant the soil of Israel to "you," the

pointed addressee. Not only with the passive and active modes of the speech in each case, the

author carefully chooses the key word: the land of Jerusalemites is more abstract as "the land"

(הָאָרֶץ) while the land granted to the *golah* community is "the soil of Israel" (אַדְמַת יִשְׂרָאֵל). This

"soil of Israel," usually translated as "the land of Israel," is indeed a unique expression of the

book of Ezekiel: it occurs 15 times throughout Hebrew Bible, and only in the book of Ezekiel.[400]

The use of this unique expression in v.17 naturally leads us to the next observation. Thus, the second observation on this verse tells that the direct speech of YHWH has been found in the book of Ezekiel as a typical phrase of the restoration formula. The same or similar syntactic structure in several verses presents YHWH as the first person "I" and plural "you" as the object of redemption. My first attention goes to the expression in 11:17, "and I will gather you (m.pl.) from the peoples" (וְקִבַּצְתִּי אֶתְכֶם מִן־הָעַמִּים)… "from the lands which you have been scattered" (מִן־הָאֲרָצוֹת אֲשֶׁר נְפֹצוֹתֶם בָּהֶם). Ezekiel 20:34 shows a very similar syntax with the switch of the verb "to gather" in the second position:

וְהוֹצֵאתִי אֶתְכֶם מִן־הָעַמִּים וְקִבַּצְתִּי אֶתְכֶם מִן־הָאֲרָצוֹת אֲשֶׁר נְפוֹצֹתֶם בָּם בְּיָד חֲזָקָה וּבִזְרוֹעַ נְטוּיָה וּבְחֵמָה שְׁפוּכָה:

(20:34)

The verb "to bring out" in a hiphil form (הוֹצֵאתִי) should be understood alongside "with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm" (בְּיָד חֲזָקָה וּבִזְרוֹעַ נְטוּיָה) as the typical phrase of the Exodus event. Ezekiel 20:41 also shows repetitive words in the similar syntax and the semantic context of the prophecy of restoration:

בְּרֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ אֶרְצֶה אֶתְכֶם בְּהוֹצִיאִי אֶתְכֶם מִן־הָעַמִּים וְקִבַּצְתִּי אֶתְכֶם מִן־הָאֲרָצוֹת אֲשֶׁר נְפֹצֹתֶם בָּם וְנִקְדַּשְׁתִּי בָכֶם לְעֵינֵי הַגּוֹיִם:

(20:41)

---

400 Fifteen times of occurrence are Ezek. 11:17; 12:19, 22; 13:9; 18:2; 20:38, 42; 21:7; 25:3, 6; 33:24; 36:6; 37:12; 38:18, 19. The land of Israel is also expressed as אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל in the book of Ezekiel as well as elsewhere in Hebrew Bible.

Ezekiel 36:24 shows the exact phrase with v.17 phrase and interestingly it also shares the unique term "to your soil" (אֶל־אַדְמַתְכֶם). With this expression, it became clear that the soil of Israel in 11:17 was originally "your soil," i.e., the *golah* community, or vice versa:

וְלָקַחְתִּי אֶתְכֶם מִן־הַגּוֹיִם וְקִבַּצְתִּי אֶתְכֶם מִכָּל־הָאֲרָצוֹת וְהֵבֵאתִי אֶתְכֶם אֶל־אַדְמַתְכֶם:
(36:24)

Ezekiel 37:21 shows a more interesting phenomenon that, although this verse uses the same typical expressions as 11:17, it keeps the third person plural pronoun instead of using "you" (m. pl.). The syntax of this verse also shows as [conjunction + imperative of "to say" for the commissioning formula + the divine speech formula + divine speech per se.]. After that, within the direct speech, the two typical expressions appear with the third person plural object: "and I will gather them" (וְקִבַּצְתִּי אֹתָם) and "to their soil" (אֶל־אַדְמָתָם):

וְדַבֵּר אֲלֵיהֶם כֹּה־אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה הִנֵּה אֲנִי לֹקֵחַ אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִבֵּין הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר הָלְכוּ־שָׁם וְקִבַּצְתִּי אֹתָם מִסָּבִיב וְהֵבֵאתִי אוֹתָם אֶל־אַדְמָתָם:
(37:21)

The above selective examples may support a diachronic conclusion that in this restoration context, the typical expressions of 11:17 would be inserted by the redactors. Admitting the later insertion, I would point out that the final redactor could keep the third person masculine plural form "them" as the object of this beneficiary redemption as we saw in the case of 37:21. Nonetheless, the redactor did not choose that option, probably to more actively react to the Jerusalemites as I argued earlier and to go along with other typical expressions which use the "you" (m.pl.) object.

Third, similar expressions found in Jeremiah 29 prompts us to do an intertextual reading between the two texts. The highlighted parts show the similar syntax, even with the closing

formula "utterance of YHWH." With the Exodus motive together, we may conjecture the

possibility of the interaction between the two books or the two communities: [401]

וְנִמְצֵ֣אתִי לָכֶם֮ נְאֻם־יְהוָה֒ וְשַׁבְתִּ֣י אֶת־(שְׁבִיתְכֶם֒) [שְׁבוּתְכֶ֔ם] וְקִבַּצְתִּ֣י אֶתְכֶ֗ם מִֽכָּל־הַגּוֹיִם֙ וּמִכָּל־הַמְּקוֹמֹ֔ות אֲשֶׁ֨ר

הִדַּ֧חְתִּי אֶתְכֶ֛ם שָׁ֖ם נְאֻם־יְהוָ֑ה וַהֲשִׁבֹתִ֣י אֶתְכֶ֔ם אֶל־הַ֨מָּק֔וֹם אֲשֶׁר־הִגְלֵ֥יתִי אֶתְכֶ֖ם מִשָּֽׁם׃

(Jer. 29:14)

The fourth and final observation on this verse makes me again bring up the Foucaultian

panopticon setting here. Although this discussion more closely fits in the Settings section, let us

continue capturing the meanings from 11:17. We started by imagining Foucault's transparent

glass between the parties of YHWH/Ben Adam, Jerusalemites, and the *golah* community. With

this invisible glass, although traditional and natural communication is not possible, Ben Adam

can see what YHWH can see as Edgar Conrad argues.[402]

Now, let us set up the virtual space where Jerusalemites and the *golah* community were

sitting in one room as the court setting. The court language within the disputation genre allows

the imagination that YHWH is the ultimate judge, Ben Adam is the mediator or the attorney for

the *golah* community who is offended, and the Jerusalemites is the prosecutor with the head

Pelatiah. With this setting, the death of Pelatiah in Ben Adam's prophecy can be understood as

when Ben Adam, the courtier of YHWH, proclaims the sentence: the offender was sentenced.

Moreover, we know that this salvation oracle narrative starts from the lament of Ben Adam, who

temporarily acts as the attorney of the opposite party (Jerusalemites) whom the judge hates. As

an answer of this ignorant lament, the judge quoted the sayings and deeds of the offenders. If the

---

[401] Cf. Holladay, "Had Ezekiel Known Jeremiah Personally?"

[402] Conrad, *Reading the Latter Prophets,* especially chapter 2.

previous unit (11:1-13) shows the deeds of Jerusalemites, this present unit (11:14-21) reports their sayings and YHWH, the judge, reacts against them with fire and gives his hand to the *golah* community, pointing out the winner through the pronoun "you."

Finally, let us think about the perspective of Jerusalemites, the failed offender party. Again, we need to remember that we meet the dwellers of Jerusalem through YHWH's perspective, not by encountering them through the narrator's mediation. I do not intend to argue that YHWH is an unreliable character; rather, my point is that these Jerusalemites do not have any chance to apologize for themselves, but are controlled by both YHWH and the narrator.

The second topic in this Structure section is to study the rhetorical intentions of the diverse temporal aspects in 11:21. This examination will help us figure out the identity of "those whose heart goes after their detestable things and their abominations." We have just looked through the theological implications of 11:17 in terms of the subject of redemption and its beneficiaries. One more observation, now for its temporal expression, is necessary for the reading of 11:21. Here is 11:21:

וְאֶל־לֵב שִׁקּוּצֵיהֶם וְתוֹעֲבוֹתֵיהֶם לִבָּם הֹלֵךְ דַּרְכָּם בְּרֹאשָׁם נָתַתִּי נְאֻם אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה׃

Our task is to seek the answer of the question: who are the wicked heart bearers? Ezekiel 11:17 clearly distinguishes the future and past activities of YHWH when we read the future imperfect tense regarding the return of the exiles. Two verbs in v. 17, "to gather" (וְקִבַּצְתִּי) and "to assemble" (וְאָסַפְתִּי), are the future tense as ᵂᵉ-QTL. Meanwhile, the scattered reality is expressed in the past as perfect tense (QTL) נְפֹצוֹתֶם. This perfect tense of the *niphal* form indicates that YHWH's scattering or their being scattered has been already started or completed. I argue that 11:21 should be understood in this context as the repetitive punishment against the

Jerusalemites, against whom YHWH constantly gives condemnation. Moreover, MT of 11:21 shows the consultation of the future sense of "to put, grant" is not necessary since the verb indicates the perfect tense as QTL נָתַ֫תִּי. This contrastive consultation is interesting in that the returnees' obedience of YHWH's decrees and ordinances is not yet fulfilled but will be done in the future as the text employs the imperfect/YQTL יֵלֵ֫כוּ (11:20). Moreover, the removal of the stone heart[403] will be granted by YHWH to the next generation of the *golah* community as is prophesized in 11:19. The content of the prophecy from vv.18-20 shows very strong divine will as the initiative[404] in transforming the human beings, including the *golah* community. This divine transforming program does not depend on the voluntary conversion of the human mind but on the firm plan of YHWH. In other words, as we see in the case of the second generation of Exodus in the book of Numbers, in which the grant of entering the Promised Land was not based on their merit but on the grace of God, the same principle would be applied in the future. According to Halbwachs' Collective Memory and Tuan's Making a Place theory, this past memory and the future agenda are indeed very reasonable for the leader of the exilic community.[405]

Ezekiel 11:14-21, as mentioned earlier, shows the miniature-like divine plan of the book of Ezekiel at the still early stage, the punishment for the entire purge. Therefore, "the people" who are condemned would not be those who practice the abominable things among the *golah* community. Rather, the repetitive vocabulary "abominable things" in Ezekiel 8 makes it possible

---

[403] For the ANE context of this stone heart removal, see Bodi, *The Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra*, 95-110; idem, "The Motif of the Seven Executioners in Ezek 9 and the Divine Seven (*Sebetti*) in the *Poem of Erra*." And also in Part I, Chapter 1 of the present study.

[404] Cf. Paul M. Joyce, *Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel*. LHB/OT, JSOTSup 51 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

[405] Halbwachs, *Collective Memory*, 52-80; Tuan, *Space and Place*, 179-98.

to link this unit in Ezekiel 11 to Ezekiel 8, the eyewitness scene of the abominable practices in Jerusalem temple. With these observations, I would introduce another possibility of interpreting the last verse as the confirmative and conclusive sentence against the offender Jerusalemites. As an alternative reading,[406] I read 11:21 as "'To the heart *bearer* who is walking after their detestable things and their abominations, I have brought their deeds upon their own heads', utterance of YHWH."

4.2.2.2 Genres and Languages

The most dominant genre of this unit is the Salvation oracle. Although it is located at the end of the first temple vision, it still surprises its reader since the prophecy of the restoration is in the midst of the vision of the judgment. Moreover, by this salvation oracle, as we have seen, the double rejection concerning Jerusalemites was presented. In other words, 11:14-21 shows the exclusion of Jerusalemites in three ways: 1) by foretelling the restoration in the future in the situation that the execution has been done in the city; 2) by foretelling that YHWH will dwell with the exiles for a while, not with the remaining Jerusalemites; 3) by prophesying to slaughter the fugitives on the border of Israel. Hope and desperation go together as both sides of one coin. Discard of the Jerusalemites is obvious enough but we need to pay attention to one more thing in this salvation oracle in the larger context, too. As I have constantly emphasized, this first temple vision is an exception that the *golah* community avoids becoming the target of God's harsh criticism. The reason is probably related to the theme and the purpose of the vision, in which the

---

[406] The term "alternative" comes from my respect for most English translations which take the future tense for "to bring," i.e., I will bring their deeds upon their heads. The reason I respect this option and limit my interpretation as an alternative reading lies in reading this verse in the larger context, too. Although the *golah* community does not become of the target of the criticism in Ezekiel 8-11, eventually the harsh criticism of YHWH fell upon this *golah* community. This first temple vision is unique on this matter, since throughout chapters 1-33, it is rare for the *golah* community not to be condemned but wins YHWH's favorites.

author attempts to plan a new concept of their exile, i.e., exile is not the punishment but the peculiar form of redemption; therefore, their Babylonian town is transformed as the wilderness-like liminal space rather than the land of bondage.[407] It should work like a waiting room or incubator for the new birth.

Unfortunately, however, when we consider the entire book of Ezekiel, we come to know that the new people in YHWH's restoration agenda shall be neither the remaining Jerusalemites nor the current generation of the exiles. They are both the "rebellious house of Israel" so far. The hope goes to the exiles, not to the Jerusalemites. But, that hope comes true only after a radical transformation shall be done to the people, as presented in the dry bone vision in 37:1-14. This also makes us consider separating the literary audience from the target audience.

Other languages or formulae which are found in this unit include the disputation and the covenant formula, "They will become as people to me and I will become as God to them." This typical covenant making formula was given to the audience without any condition, which suggests that the process of restoration almost excludes the human beings' initiative "return" to God. This is quite different from what Deuteronomy 30:1-10 presents.[408] Using this formula for the *golah* community, the strong predilection for the *golah* community reaches its climax, but with verse 21 the text reconfirms that Jerusalemites are standing at the opposite side.

A clear rhetoric of giving the winner's ticket to the *golah* community appears also in the word choice of the author. The phenomenon shown in chapter 11 and in 43:3 is interesting. It is

---

[407] Cf. Laura Feldt's study in terms of transformation of the foreign place into the wilderness- like space for YHWH's stage in the national crisis. Laura Feldt, "A Walk on the Wild Side with Yahweh: A Spatial Perspective on the Hebrew Deity in the National Epic," *SJOT* 28, no. 2 (2014): 185-211.

[408] I have compared the process of restoration presented in Ezekiel 43 with the two Pentateuch passages, Leviticus 26:40-45 and Deuteronomy 30:1-10. Soo J. Kim, "Ashamed before the Presence of God" (paper presented at the annual meeting of Society of Biblical Literature, Baltimore, Maryland, November 22-25, 2013).

well known that one of the literary functions of Ezekiel 40-48 is to play the role of the answers/solutions for Ezekiel 8-11. More specifically, we also observed the author's careful matching of the terms in depicting the returning of the glory of the God of Israel in ch. 43 and the departure of the glory of the God of Israel in ch. 10. What is new in this section comes from the salvation language in this unit.

The ironically opposite aspect of YHWH in this first temple vision can be supported by the counterpart text of Ezekiel 8-11, especially Ezekiel 43 in which the glory of the God of Israel returns. In the retrospective manner, Ben Adam fell his face upon the ground when he was able to identify the glory which he saw before in the first temple vision. The tendency of connecting the present scene with the former experience is not new in the book of Ezekiel, but the expression in 43:3 draws my attention: Ben Adam the narrator gives YHWH the nickname "destroyer" (מַשְׁחִית), which once appeared in 9:6.[409]

4.2.2.3 Settings

Ezekiel 11:14-21 is famous for its historical setting as a later insertion. As we have studied, however, this present study has delved more into the possible intention of the final redactor group, rather than the straightforward application of the assumed compositional dates.

Meanwhile, in reader's setting, it is an overall very positive divine salvation oracle for the elders of Judah who appeared in 8:3. This positive consultation to the exiles may function later as the basis of the condemnation in 14:1 and 20:1. However, we need to remember again that this is our conjecture without hearing any speech directly from their mouth, and only get the information from God's mouth.

---

[409] André Neher, "Ezéchiel, rédempteur de Sodome," *RHPR* 59 (1979): 485.

With the expression of "speaker of allegory" in 20:49, one may argue that there must be an execution of the divine speeches in the oral performance form. However, counterargument is also possible that the content of the oracle is not so understandable and consequently miscommunication between the prophet and the people as well as between the people and God is possible. Blame can go either way. It can be due to the rebellious mindset of the captives in that they do not want to listen to the divine oracle at all, or it can be due to the messenger's insufficient or derivative deliverance.

That this salvation or restoration is only applicable to the captives indeed reappears in the dried bone vision in 37:1-14 as a more explicit agenda. The Dried Bone Vision is the most fantastic and dramatic vision in the book of Ezekiel, both in terms of its spectacular and shocking transition from the dried bones to the almighty armies. Ezekiel 38-39 tells somewhat about the great scale of invasion and fire destruction, but this is a telling of the future in the form of prophecy. But the dried bone vision shows what is happening in the narrative time. In terms of broadcasting manner, Ezekiel 10 also shows spectacles but it avoids the vivid depiction when the heavenly executioner Linen Man brought the fire. It is only alluded that Jerusalem was destroyed by this execution, like Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by fire.

4.2.3 Narrator's report on the moving of the cherubim and the glory (11:22-23)

1. The cherubim moves to prepare the departure   11:22
2. The departure of the glory   11:23

4.2.3.1 Structure

This is the closing scene of the Second "The Spirit Lifted Me Up" account. With the closing divine speech formula "Utterance of YHWH" in v.21, YHWH's sayings in Ezekiel 8-11. As I titled the previous unit, the divine speech from v.14 to v.21 is framed by the salvation oracle

formula. It is the narrator's report on the divine speech, and this current sub-unit also belongs to the narrator's report. Thus, apparently this unit continues from the previous unit since it has the same agent, Ben Adam the narrator, and his narration, but the main syntax and semantic aspects of the two units are different enough to separate.

4.2.3.2 Genres and Languages/Settings

In this short sub-unit, the discussion of its genre and literary setting are closely interwoven so that the combined discussion is more effective. As mentioned in Structure, the main genre of this unit is narrative. But, it is ambiguous who tells this movement of the glory with the cherubim's company. This is one of the rare cases in which Ben Adam the character as eyewitness does not come to the front but completely hands over his duty to Ben Adam the narrator. In other words, this scene is very heterodiegetic in narration, although the literary context suggests that readers accept it as continuation of the first-person narration.

The readers' recognition of continuance belies the heterodiegetic characteristic of this new sub-unit. While the narrative place changes extending up to "the midst of the city" and "the mountain that is on the east side of the city" (11:23), readers still cannot take notice of the change. The reason is that the text, in the first place, does not mention anything of the location of Ben Adam the character-narrator. This makes a clear contrast with the narrative situation for Ben Adam in 9:6-8. Whereas Ben Adam in 9:6-8 should be bound in one place, i.e., the inner-court of the temple with YHWH the ultimate judge, Ben Adam here in 11:22-23 is free, and so free that he can hide his location to us readers. In narratological terms, the author uses "the covert narrator" in this case so that readers are not aware of who tells and who perceives but easily rely on the narration.

Another conspicuous feature in using language is that the short closing account avoids the proper name "Jerusalem." Even in this virtual space, Jerusalem cannot be called by its own name Jerusalem. Jerusalem, the wife of YHWH, once the delight of her husband YHWH by bearing his dwelling place, is killed and now called "the city." This treatment of Jerusalem in this first temple vision reminds me of the same treatment of "Jerusalem" in the realistic presentations in the rest of the book of Ezekiel. In this first temple vision, the narrator in the vision utterly stops calling the city Jerusalem after the Linen Man's report of the complete destruction; the only exception is when he allows it for the reference of the opposite party as the dwellers of Jerusalem in the divine speech in 11:15. Likewise, throughout the book of Ezekiel, in real-space descriptions, the title Jerusalem never appears after being mentioned in 33:21 as the fugitives' escaping town "Jerusalem"; the only exception is when the author allows the divine speech to use it in the analogy between the future glory of Israel and the former glory of Jerusalem in 36:38.[410] In the first temple vision, the complete absence of the name Jerusalem after Ezekiel 9 is intended to connote the complete death or demise of Jerusalem. By employing the same technique, the actual report in 33:21 is, then, the confirmation of this vision, also being the fulfillment of the symbolic death of Jerusalem, through Ezekiel's wife the explicit metaphor of Jerusalem as YHWH's sanctuary in ch. 24. In this way, in 11:22-23, the first temple vision puts another stone in the work of making the miniature of the book of Ezekiel.

As the third topic, let us think about the glory in terms of its residing place. The term "the glory" appears already in "the glory of the God of Israel" in 9:3 in which the movement of YHWH's throne is progressive and gradual. From this view, the choice of the author/redactor for

---

[410] See my article, "YHWH Shammah: The City as Gateway to the Presence of YHWH," *JSOT* 39, no. 2 (2014): 187-207.

the east gate Ben Adam's last vision tour seems very wise for the sake of the economical

movement of the narrative.

The east gate as the literary setting marks several points in the book of Ezekiel as well as

in the prophetic literature. In the first temple vision, the fact that the movement direction of the

glory states a strong polemic against those who are   standing toward the east, firstly the sun

worshippers in chapter 8, secondly those who are standing at the entrance of the east gateway in

chapter 11. Both are especially abominable because they violate the heavenly king's highway.

The offended emotion of YHWH in this first temple vision is straightforwardly reflected in the

final temple vision. For this reason, I read the final temple vision, Ezekiel 40-48 as the

rectification of the first temple vision. In Ezekiel 43-44, the text proudly presents the return of

the glory of the God of Israel (pay attention to the same title) through the east gate and the

solemn warning to shut down the east gate in the new temple, to prevent potential violation to the

way of God's movement. With the help of the intertextual reading including the book of

Habakkuk and several Psalms, we see the similar conviction that YHWH comes from the east to

renew his creation.[411]

4.3 Third "The Spirit lifted me": from the east gate to Babylon (11:24)

4.3.1 Sixth "it brought me" to the exiles in Chaldea   11:24

A. Return to Chaldea by the Spirit's transportation   11:24a
B. Disappearance of the vision   11:24b

---

[411] See also for Sweeney's discussion on the Habakkuk tradition and the possible
understandings of the character sun worshippers in Ezekiel 8. Sweeney, "Ezekiel: Zadokite Priest
and Visionary Prophet of Exile," 135.

4.3.1.1 Structure

This verse shows basically the same syntactic structure with the verse 8:3b: subjects as "the Spirit"; direct objects as "me"; the dynamic verbs "come/go" as *hiphil* form of 3rd person feminine singular to receive its feminine singular noun "the Spirit" as its subject; and the directive particle attached to the destinations, Jerusalem and Chaldea, respectively.

However, several differences are also noticeable. In 11:24, the vision is used in singular (בַּמַּרְאֶה) while in the starting point in 8:3 the vision is plural (בְּמַרְאוֹת אֱלֹהִים). This phenomenon can be understood as reflecting the natural, economical tendency of language: a closing verse handles the same account in a briefer manner than an initial verse did. Still, there is another difference: in 8:3, "the visions of God' is as a condition of the journey, but in 11:24, the vision becomes now the subject. To comprehend this matter, the study of verb וַיַּעַל is required first.

The consultation of this verb (וַיַּעַל) with English translation can be summarized into two options: "left" (NAB, NAS, NRS, NIV) and "went up" (JPS, ESV and KJV). These two translations seem not that different in their meanings. However, in Genesis 17:22 and 35:13, I find a similar narrative situation using similar syntactic and semantic strategies; and this draws my attention to reconsider the semantics of the "vision" of our text in comparison to the Genesis narrative.

וַיְכַל לְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ וַיַּעַל אֱלֹהִים מֵעַל אַבְרָהָם׃

  (Gen. 17:22)

וַיַּעַל מֵעָלָיו אֱלֹהִים בַּמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר אִתּוֹ׃

(Gen. 25:13)

וַיַּעַל כְּבוֹד יְהוָה מֵעַל תּוֹךְ הָעִיר וַיַּעֲמֹד עַל־הָהָר אֲשֶׁר מִקֶּדֶם לָעִיר׃

(Ezek. 11:23)

וְרוּחַ נְשָׂאַתְנִי וַתְּבִיאֵנִי כַשְׂדִּימָה אֶל־הַגּוֹלָה בַּמַּרְאֶה בְּרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים וַיַּעַל מֵעָלַי הַמַּרְאֶה אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי׃

(Ezek. 11:24)

In all four verses, we find 1) the same verb with the same form as ^{waw} YQTL (וַיַּעַל) with God or God related subjects including vision or glory; 2) the order of the subject and the prepositional phrase seems flexible that Gen. 17:22 and Ezek.11:23 have the subject first while Gen. 35:13 and Ezek.11:24 show the preposition + pronoun first. Then, the subject of the verb and the narrative situation draws my attention in this comparison: in Genesis it is God (אֱלֹהִים) in both cases, while in Ezekiel it is either the glory of YHWH (כְּבוֹד יְהֹוָה) or the vision (הַמַּרְאֶה). This suggests that in the first temple vision, the glory and the vision might be used equivalent to the deity himself.

4.3.1.2 Genres and Languages

As a closing section, this unit is stated by Ben Adam narrator. Itinerary languages are significant and the two main plot moving verbs, "lift up" and "bring" appear in this closing statement. The peculiarity of this section is the reappearance of the interlocutor group, now with its name changed to the captives/exiles. The title "elders of Judah" does not exist anymore. We can interpret this change either as the vision is delivered to the extended literary audience[412] or as emphasis on the reality of the elders. I prefer to interpret this change with the latter case, since the text does not seem to emphasize the actual deliverance of the vision but to show the closing of the account with the confirmation that the target addressee was the *golah* community not the Jerusalemites.

---

[412] Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, 191.

CHAPTER 5. Closure of the Vision Narrative (11:25)

5.1 Closure of the Vision Narrative: Report of the narrator (11:25)

5.1.1 Structure

Let us first consider the translation matter of this last sentence.

וָאֲדַבֵּר אֶל־הַגּוֹלָה אֵת כָּל־דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הֶרְאָנִי: פ

"And I spoke to the captive all the things of YHWH which he showed me."

The phrase דברי יהוה can be either "words of YHWH" or "things of YHWH." I translate that phrase as the latter, the matter, which can cover all happenings in Jerusalem in the vision. However, if one take the first option, this verse shows that words become what one can see. It seems somewhat strange but indeed the book of Ezekiel already showed this similar situation. Before in Ezekiel 2 and 3, we readers experience that the word/the scroll where the words of YHWH were written becomes internalized to Ben Adam. Ben Adam has the duty to tell what he saw to the addressee, in this case, "the captive." This addressee is pre-designated as wicked, stubborn and rebellious before Ben Adam gets the mission in chs. 2-3. From then on, those characteristics are never uttered through the mouth of Ben Adam the character. Even the narrator does not say any word of his narratee. Always it is YHWH who evaluates them as such, sometimes by showing their wicked deeds and words and sometimes by revealing their inner thoughts. Another strange thing about the captive (הגולה) is that there is no response from them to this overwhelmingly shocking news. In Exodus 4, the elders of Israel express the respect and praise to LORD when they heard about the deliverance of YHWH. When Eli in 1 Samuel and Hezekiah in Isaiah heard their tragic endings respectively, each man also expresses through his

mouth even though both were also wired. Here in the book of Ezekiel, interestingly, the deliverance detail is minimum; i.e., it is just a report of reporting.

Finally, this brief sentence makes us revisit our first assumption that the elders of Judah in 8:1a were the narratee. Yes, they are narratee; but they are so, just as Ben Adam is the narrator with the limitation of the first person narrative. I would challenge that the elders of Judah are not the actual narratee, but a literary narratee who should be classified as a character. In the whole context of the book of Ezekiel, the captives including the elders of Judah are at least not a good model narratee, and the implied readers should not imitate their attitude. For YHWH, they are completely rebellious; for the narrator Ben Adam, they are completely no-response. As mentioned in the previous unit, good treatment of the exiles or the *golah* community in this unit ends now with the wrap-up sentence of the vision narrative, and their status or YHWH's attitude towards the exiles comes back to cold and harsh criticism. So the demarcation of the first temple vision with the next chapter 12 is also marked by this radical change of the attitude towards the captives.

Then, we ask, who is the implied audience/reader of this vision? What effects or powers can the first person narrative have, especially in the vision report form? Dieter Meindl summarizes the privileges of the first person narrative include ownership, authenticity, and intimacy.[413] I would add "encouragement" to this list: the implied author encourages his readers to imitate the role model Ben Adam. The generic name Ben Adam is one of the markers which indicate the calling for the readers to put themselves in Ben Adam's shoes.

---

[413] Dieter Meindl, "(Un-)Reliable Narration from a Pronominal Perspective," in *The Dynamics of Narrative form: Studies in Anglo-American Narratology*, Narratologia, ed. John Pier (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 69.

5.1.2 Genres and Languages

The eyewitness form of recounting the narrative is done in a very abstract and descriptive way. Likewise, this last sentence thoroughly hides the reaction of the audience by keeping them as background of the vision report. Nonetheless, they are literary audience, therefore the characters in the story. As mentioned, the selected group of the elders of Judah gets to have the more general titles such as captives, the *golah* community. After the complete separation from the Jerusalemites, now there seems no division among the *golah* community. The elders appear only as the representative of the community visiting Ben Adam to ask the divine will. The strangeness lies in again that the divine revelation seems not so influential to their exilic lives. For, we readers still do know how they changed their live style. The only one sure thing is the further the story goes on, the severer YHWH's criticism gets.

5.1.3 Settings

Regarding the social settings including ritual, the first temple vision shows many negative examples but not a positive example. The almost instinct reaction of Ben Adam when he saw the glory of YHWH is throwing his face upon the ground resembles some ritualistic feature of the priest in front of the theophany.

The sitting in front of a priest-prophet itself might become quasi-ritualistic during the Babylonian exile. Moreover, we see the potential picture of the Jewish synagogue in this divine inquiry setting. Dale Launderville argues the book of Ezekiel shows the potential picture regarding the ritual of the temple-detached community. As a privileged group, unlike the leftover Jerusalemites, the exiles' efforts to keep their status as God's people are put more and more on

the ethical matters than ritual matters.[414] His argument seems persuasive on one hand in terms of

the temple lost society, but we need not to miss the point that the ethical and ritualistic aspects

from individual's activity and social consciousness are hardly separated.

---

[414] Dale Launderville, *Spirit and Reason: The Embodied Character of Ezekiel's Symbolic Thinking* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 22.

Now, we would like to understand Ezekiel 8-11 based on the form critical analysis, which concerns both synchronic and diachronic dimensions of the text. In making the overall structure, the most noticeable issue comes from 11:1, "The Spirit lifted me up", as I discussed in Chapter 4.

The problem remaining from the synchronic reading was that "the Spirit lifted me up" in 11:1 has a different scale from the first and the last uses of the phrase in terms of its movement distance. The content of 11:1-23 which the Second "Spirit Lifted Me Up" leads does not function the same as other two, the opening and the closing statements of the vision account. And the apparently contradicting statement between chapter 9 and chapter 11—if readers follow the temporal sequence, as we observe—makes us rethink in making the formal structure and understanding of the text.

The problem remaining from the diachronic reading includes that the possible many editorial layers are abandoned as torn apart, once being pointed by various diachronic scholars. Although it explains the phenomenon of the peculiarity of chapter 11, it does not explain the intention of the final redactor who puts 11:1-21 in the present form and in the present location. Moreover, this approach does not advise readers how to read and understand the final form of the text. Indeed, the questions of the diachronic approach might not be interested in those questions that I had.

Now, a heuristic application of advanced form criticism should come up. According to Knierim's advice on the conceptual analysis, any kind of well-written document has grammatical and syntactical cohesion at the surface level as well as conceptual unity which can cover the

whole text at the deeper level.[415] Although I doubt the possibility of the existence of the ideal

concept which can hover over the text, as mentioned in Part I, Knierim's distinction between the

supra-syntagmatic factors and infratextual concept can help my two distinct levels of structure-

making in this text. In my reading, his terms supra- and infra-structures will be applied to 6.1

Formal Structure from the Synchronic Reading and 6.2 Semantic Structure from the Heuristic

Reading, respectively. As we have seen in Part II Chapters 3, 4, and 5, at the surface level, the

divisions are made from three occurrences of "The Spirit lifted me up" and six occurrences of

"He/it Brought Me." Meanwhile, at the deeper level, within the framework of the two "Spirit

lifted me up" in the beginning and the end, we have the second "Spirit lifted me up" in 11:1,

which is waiting for special attention from the reader. If we separate this unit as we do in the

formal structure making, the semantic structure becomes a blur, and readers will remain with

unanswered questions about the reason of this structure heading in our present text. But, with the

recognition from the diachronic study, we may see 11:1-21 as the divine execution scene.

To avoid any potential confusion by using Knierim's terms, I use the general form critical

terms which are used by Schweizer, too. Diachronic analysis on Ezekiel 8-11, which we have

seen in Chapter 4, does not affect to change the whole structure of Ezekiel 8-11, not because the

seams are not strong enough, but because the present form can still be read logically, even if we

consider the diachronic layers within the present form of the text. My studies on the diachronic

approach make it possible to discern the role of the redactors with various historical and literary

settings and make me go further to think one more time about the overall structure, i.e., the

intention (what) and expression (how) of the text. These are the two kinds of aim of the present

---

[415] Knierim's conceptual analysis is applied to several works including, Won W. Lee, *Punishment and Forgiveness in Israel's Migratory Campaign* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 54.

study in methodological exploration which I addressed in Chapter 1 Introduction. My findings are reflected in 6.3 Overall Structure of Ezekiel 8-11 Both Formal and Thematic Features.

6.1 Formal structure from the synchronic reading

Following are the summaries of the discussions of Structure in each unit from Chapter 3 through Chapter 5.

A. In addition to the account/narrative framework in the beginning and ending form, this first temple narrative shows three major movements by the supernatural power in the vision These movements are marked by the form or formula. "The Spirit Lifted me up" וַתִּשָּׂא אֹתִי רוּחַ. This form should be the basic division marker since it also marked the important thematic division of the unit. The first movement is from Babylon to Jerusalem; the second movement is from the temple to the east gate by interrupting the story of the appearance of YHWH in chapter 10; and the third movement is from Jerusalem back to Babylon among captives.

B. The next sub-units are made by the expression "he brought me" (וַיָּבֵא אֹתִי[416]). Whenever both clauses appear together, the subject of the verb "to bring" becomes third person feminine, to match with the Spirit. In other cases, however, presuming the subject "YHWH" it attributes the subject as "he" third person masculine singular. This typical expression makes possible the temple/city tour in vision. This formal repetition can also be used as the sub-division marker since all four formal indicators function in Ezekiel 8 as the means of showing the greater abominations in the City and the Temple. This suggests that the tour is not designed by certain directions or random movement; rather, it

---

[416] Cf. 8:3 uses the 3fs form of the verb since the agent is the Spirit (f.s.).

follows the gradation of the seriousness in abomination. Along with this gradational literary device, readers finally encounter the several crucial scenes including the destruction of Jerusalem, the divine wrath in the speech, and departure of the glory.

C. Ezekiel 8:17-18 function as transition from Ben Adam's moving and seeing to the role of spectator. This stillness is important because in this block, Ben Adam the narrator is now allowed to act more like a character and expresses his own thoughts and emotions. In this still scene, Ben Adam plays more on the perspectives of the audience, while in the former scene, Ezek. 8:3-16, Ben Adam acts as quasi-YHWH to show the reality of the invisible Jerusalem Temple and invisible God's mind. In Ezekiel 8, Ben Adam stands as priest as a mediator between God and people, as a representative of God; in chapters 9 and 11, he kneels down before God as the voice of people as prophet to appeal their concern to YHWH.

D. Ezekiel 9 is more on the telling of the destruction scene of Jerusalem except a few scenes including the glory of YHWH scene and 9:7. This verse seems strange by telling this וְהִכּוּ בָעִיר (Ezek. 9:7). Here, suddenly the text uses the narrator's shrewd telling strategy. In other words, the character Ben Adam experienced the executioners' striking in some mysterious way, but the text only reports it as one sentence "They struck." In verse 8, the strange governance continues saying that "when they struck, I was alone" so the character Ben Adam was not with them and Ben Adam was not a witness, but without any report, or even before receiving/hearing that report, the author uses the heterodiegetic narrator to narrate that happened. This gives the simultaneous empathy of Ezekiel, as the character, narrator, and implied author, to his audience, showing that this is a serious matter. As we

245

shall see, this ambiguous and mysterious presentation appears again in the scene of Plataiah's death when Ben Adam prophesies in 11:13. Exactly the same response was used by Ben Adam: "Will you kill all the remnants of Israel?"

E. The third sub-unit marker is that "I saw" with and without "behold." There are two streams or pillars to lead the plot of the vision: one is the narrator's report on the movement and events, and the other is the character's self-disclosure in his new discoveries. Between the two, the present structural analysis weighs more on the narrator's report than on the movement. The principle of the main line is to follow the moving line and report the event line. Thus, any description, emotion, or feelings are to be regarded as an interruption of the main stream in plot development though these provide very important textual moods. These interrupting descriptions are usually marked as [ ] and if they are related to the description of the God of Israel, then they are highlighted in gray color.

I	Setting for the vision narrative: (time; place; narrator; narrate[417])	8:1a

II	Introduction of the moving character YHWH	8:1b-8:3a
A.	Abstract introduction of YHWH: The hand of YHWH	8:1b
B.	[Interruptive description] YHWH's appearance using similes	8:2
C.	Resuming the "hand" of YHWH: Hand as the transportation method of the journey	8:3a

III	The Vision Tour: Round Trip from Chaldea to Jerusalem	8:3b-11:24
A.	First "The Spirit lifted me up": from Babylon to Jerusalem/Temple	8:3b-10:22
	First "It brought me":[418] arrival at Jerusalem	8:3b-8:6
1.		
	a. [Narrator's Focalization] on the jealousy provoking image: Description of the north gate around	8:3b
	b. [Character's focalization] on discovery of the glory of YHWH	8:4
	1) Emphasis of the coexistence of the glory and the jealous image	8:4a
	2) Emphasis of the connection of the experience in Babylon	8:4b
	c. Narrator's report of the new information through the divine command and character's obedience	8:5-6
	1) Divine command to see the northward	8:5a
	a) Divine speech formula	8:5aα
	b) Speech per se	8:5aβ
	2) Ben Adam's Obedience	8:5b
	a) Report of the Obedience	8:5bα
	b) Ben Adam the Character's recognition of the image	8:5bβ
	3) Divine Education #1 using Ben Adam's visual experience	8:6
	a) Divine speech formula	8:6aα
	b) Speech per se	8:6aβ-6bγ
	(1) Confirmative rhetorical question for Ben Adam's understanding	8:6aβ
	(2) The consequential decision of YHWH to depart his sanctuary	8:6bα
	(3) Leading to the next movement to show "greater" abomination	8:6bβ-γ

---

[417] This narratee is significant in terms of the audience. No matter how they look like the background of the story, indeed they are the interlocutor of the vision account. For this reason, it is probable that the movement of the vision may be designated as the answers for the implied questions which the narratee and the narrator share. If we follow this logic, then the apparently arbitrarily set up order of the narrative might be the Question and Answer setting. Where, then, shall we find the textual evidence or even a clue of the audience inquiry? Those questions are revealed in the audience quoted sayings by YHWH most time and once by Ben Adam as well as the critique of YHWH against them.

[418] The first "he brought me" is designed to show the jealous image at the entrance of the city and of the temple. This is the first image and impression of the city and the temple which drives YHWH from his sanctuary. It functions as the first experience as well as the overall theme of the temple tour in this whole unit.

4. Fourth "He brought me" to the inner court of the temple[419]   8:16
   a. Narrator's report: moving to the inner court off the temple   8:16a
   b. [Character's perception] on the twenty-five men of sun worshippers   8:16b

5. Concluding Divine Speech[420] to Ben Adam after the fourfold visual   8:17-18
  education: Divine education/judgment
   a. Speech formula   8:17aα
   b. Speech per se   8:17aβ-18b
    1) Accusations   8:17 aβ-
                    8:17bβ
      a) Rhetorical question #1 as the education or appeal[421]   8:17 aβ
      b) Rhetorical question #2 as the transitional accusation   8:17bα
      c) YHWH cannot endure their violence   8:17bβ
    2) Judgment with "I also" as the Proper Divine Reaction   8:18a-b
      a) How: no spare nor pity   8:18a
      b) Not hear their prayer   8:18b

6. YHWH as the Ultimate Judge[422]   9:1-9:11

---

[419] Now, explicit expression of the temple inner court, though the holy of holies is still not open and is untouchable by the tourist/spectator Ben Adam the character. This space is very significant since this is the actual court, the actual sanctuary where the divine judgment will be given.

[420] The reason that I set this transitional divine speech with the equal line of "he brought" lies in the cumulative aspect of the divine judgment. If I set up these two verses, 17-18, under the fourth "he brought me" section, it may be the misunderstanding of the accusations and judgment. The accusations are not only limited to the sun worshippers in 8:16 but include all four abominable deeds of the Israelites. Now with this transition, chapter 9 shows how YHWH will perform his execution based on which he proclaims in the last two verses in chapter 8. Thus, this transitional divine speech should be in the same line with the "he brought me" as the conclusion of all four "bring me" sections. This should be under the very left line of "The Spirit lifted me up" line.

[421] This rhetorical question #1 should be understood as the calling for reaction to the fourth "he brought me" in verse 16, although I classified this one with the next clause for convenience.

[422] From this point, up to the second lift up in chapter 11, Ben Adam the character does not move, but the narrator's perception is almost unlimitedly extended. This structure treats the formal signal "he brought" as the second ultimate signal and the extension of the place should be kept in the fourth "he brought me" section. YHWH does not educate Ben Adam any more. He instead transitions from the guide figure, like bronze man in 40-48. This also tells us about the coherence of 40-48 vision with the book of Ezekiel. There, too, the two-fold presentation was given to the readers: bronze man was very active figure for the first time to set up the structure by measuring the temple structure.. .then, he gradually became passive and gave his role to YHWH himself.

Another point we need to know for this scene is that the narrator, regarding the time scheme, gives the information simultaneously. In other words, the narrator functions as the broadcaster to his reader.

---

[423] An implicit imitation of the appeal of Abraham to YHWH, but it does not work. Sodom and Gomorrah comparison with the some texts in the book of Ezekiel is not strange, including Ezekiel 16:49-50 and the "Abraham is one but we are many" phrase.

---

[424]   Though the place is the entrance of the gateway of the temple, now the focus is the city not the temple.

[425]   The omniscient character YHWH plays the role of an omniscient narrator.

6.2 Semantic structure from the heuristic reading

In the Semantic Structure of Ezekiel 8-11, I will propose my readers to read the text as

multiple presentations concerning the fall of Jerusalem. If a text is a semantic entity, what is the

nature of that semanticity which makes it a text and therefore more than simply a unitary sign or

signifier? This section starts with the conviction that grammar is a way of expressing the

speaker's concept of the world.[426]

It is not popular in the biblical world to read the text back and forth to fully appreciate the

multiple presentations of concurrent events. But, as Steven Kellman explains, the analysis of

these multiple presentations of the same incident become now more popular reading of the

postmodern fictions.[427] Dennis Pausch asserts that indeed this reading is not only probable but

also recommendable because we find the same compositional strategies in ancient

historiographies.[428] Ridderbos also points out that through these multiple presentations or "the

reiteration and recurrence of the same motifs," readers can discern the pattern of the structure

more easily and thus can understand the intention of the text underlying the surface level of the

---

[426] Eugene H. Casad, "Seeing It in More Than One Way," in *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World*, ed. John R. Taylor and Robert E. MacLaury, Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), 44.

[427] Steven G. Kellman, *The Self Begetting Novel* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 94.

[428] Dennis Pausch, "Libellus non tam diserte quam fideliter scriptus? Unreliable Narration in the Historia Augusta," *Ancient Narrative* 8 (2010): 127.

presentations.[429] We have already studied the case of Exodus 24-32. Thus, it is a good attitude for readers to ask whether the text intends non-linear reading, such as circular or spiral progressive reading, if they find some repetitive markers and some unnatural narrative flows if they read the text in a linear manner. Instead of linear structure, authors of this circular or spiral structure often get the effect that readers voluntarily practice the heuristic reading in which the readers go back to the previous units or chapters and reread with both newly gained information and with the humble suspicions that they assumed.

The whole structure of the book of Ezekiel is developed under explicit chronological remarks. But, we need to think one step further of their rhetorical intentions, too by pointing their overall effects and functions. By having these temporal signs, what has the story gained? My conclusion is that Ezekiel 8-11 shows us both recapitulatory and linear structures. At this point, W. Gordon Campbell's advice is noteworthy: "The plot progresses (in a linear way) but it also goes back over the same ground more than once (by recapitulation), never simply repeating itself but always, as it were, describing things from farther up or deeper in."[430] I find several interrelated leitmotifs from the reading of Ezekiel 8-11: if moving YHWH's sanctuary and the fall of Jerusalem work at the surface level and break the nostalgia toward Jerusalem, making Jerusalem a dystopia and creating heterotopias in the exiled land drive the text to move at the underlying level.

Followings are the conclusions for the semantic structure focusing on the solutions for the issues raised from the diachronic approach:

---

[429] Herman Ridderbos, "The Structure and Scope of the Prologue to the Gospel of John," in *Placita Pleiadia, Opstellen aangeboden aan Prof. Dr. G. Sevenster* (Leiden: Brill, 1966; also published in *Novum Testamentum* 8 (1966): 180–201. This quotation is on page 191 in the latter publication.

[430] W. Gordon Campbell, *Reading Revelation: A Thematic Approach* (Cambridge: James Clarke and Co, 2012), 43.

A. Relationship between Ezekiel 8 and Ezekiel 11 becomes clearer if we see 11:1-13 as the earthly scene of the divine execution. The ultimate effect of the tour of the temple then was to show the consequence of the abominations is death.

B. Good reason of the several proleptic narrations in Ezekiel 9 by violating the grammar rule of the first person narrative: as we see in 9:8b, "So they went out and smote in the city", this chapter overall functions as the overview of the divine execution.

C. The reason/function of appearance of the glory of the God of Israel in Ezekiel 10 would be found in the spiral effect throughout the first temple vision, as we saw in the chart above in comparison of the presentations of the executioners and the glory in chs. 9, 10, and 11. Now chapter 10 functions as the heavenly perspective scene of divine execution on Jerusalem and the temple.

D. Finally, Ezekiel 11 gets many benefits. Vogt argues that the text from the many editorial layers now appears to fail in its synthesis that the tension between three different presentations concerning the destruction of the city Jerusalem (9:4 and 9:6 as the total destruction with the destroying weapons; 10:2, 6-7 through fire destruction by the priestly figure Linen Man; and 11:1 as the survivors and the death of one person, Pelatiah as the representative of the Jerusalemite remnants).[431] Nonetheless, his concern can be better solved in my semantic reading of the text. First, the apparently contradictable statements due to the order of the sequence can be answered as the multiple presentations of the same divine execution, now in this Ezekiel 11 at the earthly level. Pelatiah, as the representative of all remnants of Jerusalemites, is killed at the very place of the house of YHWH. Second, "Spirit lifted me up", now being freed from the first key driver of the formal structure, can

---

[431] Vogt, *Untersuchungen Zum Buch Ezechiel,* 46-48.

function as the redactor's addition. So, this structure considers both synchronic and diachronic, and heuristically applies the study outcomes to the structure.

Semantic Structure of Ezekiel 8-11 from the Heuristic Application of Form criticism: The Second Stage

A. Implied inquiry from the elders of Judah at Ben Adam's house   8:1
B. Vision Narrative as an Answer to Readers: 8:3-11:24
    1.   Start: supernatural transportation   8:1-3
    2.   Divine accusations   8:4-8:16
        a. First scene of Abomination   8:4-6
        b. Second scene of abomination   8:7-13
        c. Third scene of abomination   8:14-15
        d. Fourth scene of abomination   8:16
    3. Divine Judgment   8:17-18
    4. Divine Execution   9:1-11:24
        a. Set up of the divine throne   9:1-3a
        b. three folds of the divine execution scene   9:3b-11:21
          ① Divine Execution scene as an overview: 9:1-11
          ② Divine Execution scene with the heavenly figures   10:1-22
          ③ Divine Execution scene with the earthly figure   11:1-21
        c. Withdraw of the divine throne   11:22-23
    5. closure: Ben Adam's Journey to Babylon   11:24
C. Narrator's Report on the delivery of the vision to the captives   11:25

6.3 Overall structure of Ezekiel 8-11 considering both formal and thematic features

In this alternative structure making, Harald Schweizer's multiple dimensional study for the intention of the text gives good advice.[432] In his analysis on the book of Isaiah, he examines all three linguistic signs, syntactic (for form), semantic (for function) and pragmatic (for setting) factors in determination of the intent of the text.

---

[432] Schweizer, *Metaphorische Grammatik,* 40-55.

Through the syntactical study, we can understand the formal rules of language, i.e., the side of expression or surface structure of the text, as I show in 6.1 The Formal Structure from the synchronic reading. Through the semantic examinations, we come to know the thematic plot development which is expressed through the unique syntactic structure. As Schweizer emphasizes, neither syntax nor semantics alone can reach the full understanding of the text's surface level as well as its deep structure.

Because "Spirit Lifted Me Up" appears in the middle of the journey again in 11:1, which shows some awkward narrative situation, the first Spirit Lifted Me Up phrase should perform a double function: one as the initial function as the same level with the closing formula in 11:24; and the other as the moving head of the spectacle vision in Ezekiel 8, 9, and 10. This latter function is equal to the function of 11:1 Spirit Lifted Me Up.

I would apply his basic concept to understanding of the text like Ezekiel 8-11, which shows multiple redactional layers and complicated implied authorship.

Ready to the world of the vision (8:1-2)			
First "Spirit Lifted Me Up" (8:3) as the start of the journey to Jerusalem			
First "Spirit Lifted Me Up" (8:3)		Second "Spirit Lifted Me Up" (11:1)	
Ezekiel 8 (accusations) Ezekiel 9; Ezekiel 10 (judgment and executions)	Ben Adam as a spectator of the vision	Ezekiel 11:1-13 (accusation, judgment, and execution)	Ben Adam as a prophet-priest
(the Jerusalem card has been discarded) Ezekiel 11:14-21 Oracle of salvation for the Babylonian exiles			
Third "Spirit Lifted Me Up" as the closing of the journey to Chaldea			
Back to the real world (11:24-25)			

Part III Situating Ezekiel 8-11 in the Book of Ezekiel for the Theological Reflections

With the several critical analyses on Ezekiel 8-11 in Part II, we have studied the intentions of the text. Now, Part III aims to situating Ezekiel 8-11 in the book of Ezekiel in order to appreciate its theological reflections and possible implications for today. If Part II is devoted to the form critical analysis, discourse analysis, and intertextual reading, Part III will concentrate on its temporal and spatial issues as well as their underlying theological intentions. Form critically speaking, Part III will serve as Interpretation or Intention of the Text, Ezekiel 8-11. Chapter 7 "Killing Jerusalem, Killing Babylon, and Killing False Hope" will deal with the nostalgia and dystopia issues in Ezekiel 8-11 in the larger context of Ezekiel 1-39. Chapter 8 "Indeterminacy and Heterotopia from Situated Nowhere" is about the temporal and spatial interpretation of the theological reaction of the book of Ezekiel. It reviews the discussions of the text-based analyses in Part II, now from the perspective of the exilic leader, Ben Adam. Finally, as a conclusion, Chapter 9 "Answers for the Questions in Introduction" wraps up this study by answering ten questions in Introduction.

The common issue in three spatial terms, nostalgia, dystopia, and heterotopia in this study, is Jerusalem. In front of the tragedy of the fall of Jerusalem does all three concepts become synonymous. In his city study, Urbicide, Jacob Wright emphasizes the personification of the city in the Bible as it has life and death.[433]

> "Urbicide means the killing of cities. The concept refers to the premeditated and deliberate destruction of cities, their iconic architecture, and their identity. The city per se is the target of aggression. That means that the demolition of the urban architecture is an end in itself and is less motivated by tactical reasons."[434]

From the reflected lens of the book of Ezekiel, let us imagine the mind of the captives. They consider themselves to be innocent but they also feel that they are cursed, being cut-off from the Promised Land. Therefore, for them Jerusalem is full of nostalgia.

On the contrary to the literary audience's nostalgia for Jerusalem, most prophetic books depict the life in Jerusalem in their past as full of disobedience and rebellions, thus should be abandoned. Ezekiel 8-11 is no exception. As Ben Zvi describes, the past is not compatible in drawing the picture of utopia, but "as a full blown dystopia."[435]

In this situation, the first task of the exilic priest-prophet Ben Adam must be to break their nostalgia because the more they follow this illusive nostalgia, the more the time of returning to the land becomes distant. This dimension of the cutting off the nostalgia is manifested in the form of making it a dystopia. The first dystopia is made in ch. 4: the divine command of the sign-act prophecy to make a miniature of Jerusalem, to siege it, to show that God faces against

---

[433] Wright, "Urbicide," 155. He gives an example of organic language applied to Jerusalem from Neh. 3:34 and 4:1.

[434] Wright, "Urbicide," 148.

[435] Ben Zvi, *Utopia and Dystopia*, 70.

the city, and to prophesy against it.[436] If this first dystopia of Jerusalem is made of the sign-act command, visible education, and prophecies, the second dystopia making is performed in the form of the vision in chapters 8-11. In the vision, Jerusalem becomes the actual dystopia: the temple was defiled, and the glory departed; people were smitten, and the city was desolated. As we have studied, this dystopia takes the form of interlocutor's implied inquiry (8:1) and the report of the vision as an answer of that inquiry (11:25). The third dystopia making appears in ch. 12: the divine command of the sign-act prophecy to perform bringing out a baggage of belongings as is done in exile, which is again the similar pattern with chapter 4. Like chapters 5-7, chapter 13 shows the prophecy against the implied threatening power of the false prophets. Based on the literary presentations up to chapter 13, chapter 14 begins with the harsh tone of the criticism to certain elders of Israel, i.e., the members of the *golah* community, not the Jerusalemites. The apparent reason of that criticism is later revealed as their idol worship, the same accusation having been made in Ezekiel 8. It implies that the *golah* community eventually became like the Jerusalemites despite several times of the divine education from chapter 4 to 13; thus, YHWH rebukes the captives severely. And this admonishment goes on and on with the two metaphoric condemnations on Jerusalem in Ezekiel 16 and 23.

The story of dystopia reaches the second highest level in chapter 24, the performative death of the prophet's wife, and the flow of the story stopped at the moment of the deliverance of the fugitive report in 33 of the fall of the city. This brief report in the narrative form is the highest level of dystopia, the actual death of Jerusalem, period! The dystopia of Jerusalem seems to pause for a while when the author of the book proposes the restoration prophecies and vision from chapter 34 to 37. However, even in these chapters we readers should not forget that the

---

[436] Cf. Robert Bevan, *The Destruction of Memory: Architecture at War* (London: Reaktion Books, 2006), 4-10.

name Jerusalem is not mentioned in the restoration plan. This forgotten name, or I would call

that as forbidden name, is indeed another way of making Jerusalem a dystopia. No mention of

the name "Jerusalem" after the announcement of its fall in 33:21 can be understood in terms of

"repressive erasure" as Paul Connerton classifies in his memory studies. In his study of the seven

types of forgetting, the repressive erasure is defined as that the new society erases all the

vocabularies which provoke the memory of the past culture. Connerton takes the French

Revolution as an example: it tried hard to eliminate every nobility-related words.[437]

The dystopia then reached the epilogue in Ezekiel 39, the confirmation of the death of

Jerusalem. In ch. 39, the valley of Hinnom, nearby place of old Jerusalem becomes the city

Hamonah, the grave place for the crowd. As Odell points out, in Hamonah and Hinnom, a word

play is intended to remind each other.[438] These multiple presentations of Jerusalem-dystopia will

be more discussed in 7.2 Genre Study.

According to Wright's Assyrian and Babylonian campaign study, this urbicide is the

project for destruction of memory, especially targeted to wipe out the "urban *Gedächtnisträger*

(bearers of cultural memory)".[439] With Wright's observation, we may understand Sweeney's

---

[437] Paul Connerton, "Seven Types of Forgetting," *Memory Studies* 1 (2008): 59-60.

[438] Margaret Odell, "The City of Hamonah in Ezekiel 39:11-16: The Tumultuous City of Jerusalem," *CBQ* 56, no. 3 (1994): 479-89.

[439] Wright, "Urbicide," 148. Wright also points out the peculiar depictions of 2 Kings in terms of the destruction of the two cities, Samaria and Jerusalem. The former is not depicted as urbicide but as the level of the besiege of the fortified cities, while in the latter case, on Jerusalem, the narrative explicitly applies the urbicide description on the fall of Jerusalem (151). With this insight, I would like to point again that avoidance of the vivid depiction of the fall of Jerusalem but constant mentioning of it would have some clear intention of the book of Ezekiel. See the discussion in 4.1.2 of the present study, "What makes them have strong desire to confirm: the Point."

interpretation of the jealous image in the temple entrance[440] as the active effort of Babylonian Empire to erase the old symbol of the city and to plant the new symbol.

This is the crisis from destruction of the old system for the community members in Tuan's term.[441] Then, here, we find two kinds of power dynamics from those who want to keep their memory and from those who want to erase their memory. First, there are those who want to keep the old memory and system, both home landers and the exiles. Those who remained in the Land try to keep their city, nation, and the old social orders by minimizing the time of the fluctuation and its effects. Those who went into the exile also want to keep their memory by combining nostalgia and hope. Meanwhile, Babylonian Empire and the author of the book of Ezekiel share the common goal to destroy the old system and the old cultural memory. Interestingly, the book of Ezekiel successfully depicts the Babylonian invaders as the earthly executioners who only act according as the heavenly executioners' order. This shadow of the Babylonian invasion is indeed prevalent in various contexts both explicitly and implicitly. As we studied in Part II, "executioners from the north," "Ben Adam's gesture of digging the wall," "the fire destruction," and "killing at the border of Israel" in Ezekiel 8-11 are several examples that reflect the historical tragedies in the 6th century B.C.E. in the land of Israel. The purpose of this erasure lies not only in the successful conquer in the present time; rather, the conquerors want the site of the city and the temples would not even remembered by anybody in the distant future.[442]

---

[440] Sweeney, *Reading Ezekiel*, 56.

[441] Tuan, *Space and Place*, 153-54.

[442] Wright, "Urbicide," 150.

7.1. Setting: Audience Division

Before we discuss the division of the audience as regards the different parties in the book of Ezekiel, I need to point out object-like passivity of the narratees in the book of Ezekiel. Regardless of their identities, either Jerusalemites or the *golah* community, all audiences are completely controlled by either YHWH the main character or the character narrator Ben Adam's narration. In the situation of Ezekiel 8-11, they are quoted by YHWH (8:12; 9:9); and, outside of the present study text, their sayings are quoted in the dried bone vision (37:11). By assigning narrative spaces to mention them, and employing the same strategy to handle them, the text clearly shows its interest: their deeds are "narrated" by YHWH (2:3; 8:17) or "described" by Ben Adam (8:10-11, 14, 16). This "intentional" avoidance of interaction with the audience leads us to read this book has no interest in "here and now" matter. Martiti interprets this phenomenon as "the future-oriented theological discourse that reveals nothing about the life and work of their flesh-and-blood audience." He also has the same interpretation with me that the unspecific and passive presentation of the audience is intentional by arguing that it enables more broad applications across generations by rereading according to their own situations.[443] I term this tendency as "indeterminacy" about which I shall discuss more in Chapter 8.

As Hiebel points out, it is hard to identify the historical audience of the original version, so our "audience" here is the literary audience that we meet through the text presentation.[444] Of course, our wish is that this presented audience in the text also reflects the historicity of the real world, e.g., the Babylonian exilic situation in the 6th century B.C.E.

---

[443] Nissini, "(How) Does the Book of Ezekiel Reveal Its Babylonian Context?," 92-93.

[444] Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives*, 271.

Now, throughout the book of Ezekiel, and especially in Ezekiel 8-11, the audience with utterly passivity, often "the house of Israel" or more specifically "the elders of Judah/Israel," is collectively treated as rebellious.

In the order of the frequencies, the distribution of all the titles designated for the addressees in the book of Ezekiel is following: the "house of Israel"[445]; sometimes as "sons of Israel"[446]; "rebellious house"[447]; "princes of Israel"[448]; "shepherds of Israel."[449] The term "house of Israel" is obviously dominant in naming the addressee. It is noteworthy here that out of about 30 times of occurrence, the term "the whole house of Israel" appears 6 times in 11;15; 36:10; 37:11; 39:25; and 45:6, all of which belong to the context of restoration rather than judgment. More importantly, the title with the adjective "whole" refers to the *golah* community, neither the leftover Jerusalemites nor the combined community. This suggests a significant clue for us to conjecture that the restoration plan shall be only applicable to the *golah* community, apparently not the current literary audience but their children, because the judgment falls upon both the present first exilic generations and the home landers. For the personified titles to identify the land and its inhabitants, we have "Land of Israel"[450] and "mountains of Israel."[451]

The audience who is evaluated in 1:1-3:15 is somewhat ambiguous, because, even though YHWH mentions captives, the harsh tone seems to be more applicable to the Jerusalemites. In

---

[445] בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל 3:1, 4, 5, 7, 17; 11:15; 12:9, 27; 17:2; 18:25; 20:27, 30, 39; 24:21; 33:7, 10, 20; 36:22; 37:11; 40:4; 43:10; 44:6.

[446] בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל 2:3.

[447] בֵּית הַמֶּרִי 24:3; see also 12:9; 44:6.

[448] נְשִׂיאֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל 19:1; 45:4.

[449] רוֹעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל 34:2.

[450] אַדְמַת יִשְׂרָאֵל 7:2; 12:22; 18:2; 21:7; 33:24.

[451] הָרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל 6:2; 36:1, 4, 6, 8.

the first vision in 2:4-5, for example, the children of Israel refer to the captives who are with

Ezekiel. To settle this ambiguity, Hiebel attempts to distinguish the redactional layers between

pre-and post-587 event, arguing that the house of Israel undergoes change to refer to only the

golah community after the fall of Jerusalem in 587.[452] I would like to pay attention to the two

counter-examples. First, in Ezek. 11:15, as we have seen the complicated translation issue

involved, "all of the House of Israel" seems to refer to the exiles distinct from the Jerusalemites.

However, with that textual marker, it is hard to determine our text as either pre- or post-587

event narratives. Second, I would like to think about the harsh attitude towards them in chapters

14 and 20, all of which should be assigned as pre-587 presentations in terms of their literary

settings. After debunking Hiebel's assumption, I have a rather simple picture here. Although the

elders in Babylon are presented as wicked in 14:1 and 20:1 as well as Ezekiel's first ministry in

chapters 2 and 3, in this Jerusalem vision narrative, the Babylonian captives are not condemned.

The narrative completely focuses on the Jerusalemites, especially religiously related leaders.

Interestingly, this literary audience is called the elders of Judah at the beginning of the

vision, but at the end of the vision, they are called "captive" (הגולה). While the beginning title

emphasizes their former status in the pre-exilic society and possible role within the present exilic

community, the end title implies that their former title would be useless even as an epithet, i.e.,

they are simply now the captive. As usual, they kept silent without any reaction even after this

dumbfounding report. In between the beginning and ending, we see another "elder" group in

Jerusalem as the leaders of the land. It is probable that the implied author attempts to make some

overlapping imagery with the literary audience in Babylon in his characterization, since the book

of Ezekiel occasionally criticizes both Jerusalemites and the captives.

---

[452] Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives*, 266.

The vision report started with somewhat clear revelation of the motivation of possible divine inquiry. All questions and their attitudes are based on the claims by character YHWH only. Neither Ben Adam character-narrator nor the captives character-narratee was allowed to show their attitudes.

Given this situation, all the visions are presented first to Ben Adam the character-narrator and are reported by Ben Adam the narrator-character in 11:25, the end of the big unit. Then, in 12:1 a new unit introduces the attitude again, still not by the narrator's point of view, but by using the character's direct quotation. Unfortunately, the beginning word of YHWH in 12:2 shows the evidence that the vision report by Ben Adam was not effective at all. It failed to persuade its audience to change their old worldview, as predicted already from before Ezekiel's ministry in chapter 2. It is the choice of the narrator (based on the historical author) to present certain ideas as claimed in the message from YHWH, not showing the audience's thoughts, gestures, and words in a direct way. Why? Is it fair? Let us examine its genre more closely to answer for this mater.

7.2 Genre: Effect of the Jerusalem Vision: Dystopia

Throughout the first temple vision, the book of Ezekiel makes Jerusalem a dystopia. The Jerusalem dystopia is unpacked in a four-fold manner, each chapter unpacking one side of the four. In chapter 8, the Jerusalem temple is depicted mostly based on the narrator's memory and interpreted by the narrator's agenda. From the memory, either individual or collective, Jerusalem and its temple, the chosen city, becomes the חרם-like object in which all the abominable idols are cumulatively piled up, thus must be burnt. From the narrator's agenda, killing Jerusalem is an unavoidable procedure in marching toward the later utopian restoration. In the narrator's eyes, the four points of the educational tour in Ezekiel 8 are in fact very selective with the polemical

intention against Jerusalem temple personnel at that time. Through the study, we have realized therefore that seeking parallel connections between the temple in Ezekiel 8 and Solomon's temple map is an unfruitful project. No matter how much the temple tour reflects the landscape of the temple in Jerusalem in the sixth century B.C.E., Ezekiel 8 is the product of the implied author in Babylon[453] as a series of the heterotopia making.

Ezekiel 9 is the second-fold dystopian presentation. There, the fall of Jerusalem, the destruction of the city with the defilement of the temple, was commanded and executed. No repentance, no appeal, and no delay were possible in front of the ultimate judge who decided to abandon his own city.

Ezekiel 10 is the third-fold portion of the dystopia, in which the narrator brings the holy presence of YHWH into the scene. This throne vision, the most important concept in priestly writings, is concerned with presence of YHWH, the advent of which is depicted, unfortunately, when YHWH departed his dwelling place, the temple.

Ezekiel 11, as the fourth-fold dystopian making of Jerusalem and the temple, ironically mentions the restoration. By completely excluding the Jerusalem dwellers, and by promising the temporary sanctuary in the exiled land to the Babylonian captives, Jerusalem is indeed executed in the vision. Accordingly, Pelatiah's death, as his name "fugitive" suggests, represents the death of all fugitives and prophesies the miserable destiny of all Jerusalem inhabitants.

The fall of Jerusalem or making Jerusalem a dystopian environment, started earlier from the play show with the seized Jerusalem miniature in Ezekiel 4. Now in Ezekiel 8-11, it reached its first climax. In the vision of Ezekiel 8-11, Jerusalem was accused, sentenced, and executed. Moreover, departure of her husband YHWH was vividly delivered in mimetic language. Indeed,

---

[453] It is the expressed desires of the Babylonian exilic community in the sixth century B.C.E. in my definition. Cf. narratogological terms in Part I Chapter 2.

chapter 10 reveals that YHWH's mobile throne or the glory of YHWH is identical with the awesome throne vision scene in Ezekiel 1. In other words, the glory of YHWH in fact has already left the Jerusalem temple and has appeared to Ezekiel Ben Adam in Babylonia, and just returned to Jerusalem momentarily to judge the temple and the city. Ironically, the complaint of the religious leaders that YHWH forsook the land and did not see them was partially true in this context. Hiebel encourages us to look at the quoted statement of the audience in order to understand the mind of the exiles. According to her, the Hebrew reading in 9:9 וְאֵין יְהוָה רֹאֶה

shows the denial of YHWH's existence ("non-existence of YHWH seeing" or "there is no YHWH who sees") rather than YHWH does not see them.[454] As a complete unit of the idea, Ezekiel 8-11 shows the whole blue print from dystopia to utopia for the Babylonian captives. Interestingly, as we have observed, up to this vision, the criticism upon the Babylonian captives was not so severe compared to the criticism upon the Jerusalemites. The condemnation against the Babylonian captives mainly starts from chapter 14, the similar inquiry of the elders of Judah in Ezekiel 8.

In sum, the vision fully serves as making a heterotopia by erasing the reality of the exilic life, by making Jerusalem—a nostalgic city—a dystopia, and by inserting the utopian agenda in a hasty manner.

After the vision, the book of Ezekiel reaches the second climax in terms of the death of Jerusalem in Ezekiel 24. By picking up the same metaphoric materials, e.g., the pot with meat in it, the narrative shows this scene is intimately connected to Ezekiel 8-11. Here, the death of Jerusalem is once again presented by the death of the symbolic precursor, Ezekiel's wife. The difference between the death of Pelatiah in ch. 11 and the death of Ezekiel's wife in ch. 24 is that

---

[454] Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives*, 284-85.

the latter happened in reality. From the perspective of the literary audience, the Babylonian captives, this actual death must have touched their hearts much more seriously. After the presentation of the oracles against nations from ch. 25 to ch. 32, chapter 33 finally informs the captives of the demise of Jerusalem through the mouth of the fugitive. The report must be the finishing blow to complete the work of making Jerusalem dystopia. However, the story of dystopia does not end here. It continues to present the apocalyptic invasion of Gog from Magog. Ezekiel 39 is a kind of elegy of the demised Jerusalem. This resembles the technique of Anton Chekhov's play *Our Town* or Charles Dickens' novel *A Christmas Carol*: the narrative goes further with the main characters even after the death of characters to depict this world. Readers of the book of Ezekiel also see the world after the destruction of Jerusalem in the name of Hamonah. Through this scene, the old Jerusalem, as a dead wife, could be entirely purified by fire.

How about the restoration chapters Ezekiel 40-48? Isn't the work of making the dystopian Jerusalem already finished with the elegy? Surprisingly, in reading of Ezekiel 40-48, we find additional efforts in making dystopia in the old society. As we know, the two concepts of dystopia and utopia are the two sides of the same coin. And heterotopia is the world of imagination created by those who are frustrated, have struggled, and have resisted against their given world.

Here is the chart that shows the connections of the first temple vision in chapters 8, 9, 10 and 11 to other texts, within the book of Ezekiel and outside of the book

	Within the book of Ezekiel	Outside of the book
Ch. 8	a miniature in ch. 4;	Ahaz and Manasseh in Kings
Ch. 9	fulfilment of the prophecy in chs. 4-7; anticipation of	Abraham regarding Sodom

	ch. 24 and 33	and Gomorrah in Genesis Messenger of the destroyer in Exodus
Ch. 10	Matching with ch. 1 and ch. 43 Surprisingly, the fire judgment did not fall upon the Babylonian city but upon Jerusalem. This is significant in that YHWH did not use fire destruction upon the exiles but spared them. Instead, he executed the verdict here in his own city.	Sodom and Gomorrah as a fire destruction in Genesis 19
Ch. 11	Ch. 24 (meat and pot); 33:24 with Abraham and the land	Hannaniah's death in Jeremiah (encountering with false prophet in the reality but in vision in Ezekiel)

Making Jerusalem a strong dystopia ironically reflects an extreme nostalgic desire of the literary audience, even including Ben Adam, to return to Jerusalem as well as the strong desire to deny any power of Babylon to them. According to the book of Ezekiel, the destruction of Jerusalem was not a defeat, but from a solemn divine plan. It makes heterotopia in two, and eventually three different kinds. First, the regressive heterotopia as Jerusalem, which ends up being the abominable name that should never be uttered through anyone's mouth. Second, Babylon, the physical location of the all characters living now, and the symbol of power to all nations at that time, is completely denied in the conceptual spatiality, as if a nonexistence. Third, dreaming a new city with the new temple and with return of the glory of the God of Israel works as practicing heterotopia in a progressive way.

In analysis of James Joyce's work, John S. Rickard introduces two forms of narrative memory: a voluntary retrospective memory and an involuntary proleptic memory. The former type encourages the characters to go back to the past in a conscious mode to cure or change the

270

problems of the past, while the latter explicitly pushes the characters to reorganize the memory in order to surpass the confined present.[455] In thinking about the entire book of Ezekiel, this theory can be applied to the dystopia in Ezekiel 1-39 as the voluntary retrospective memory and the utopia in 40-48 as the involuntary proleptic memory based on future agenda. Also, in the discussion of the vision account of Ezekiel 8-11, Ezekiel 8, the abominable idolatry presentation in the temple, contains more of voluntary and selective memories, whereas the proleptic overview on the destruction of Jerusalem in Ezekiel 9 and the restoration prophecy, which is not so natural in the context of punishment, show more of the involuntary dynamic memory as a force of the future. This "textual memory" therefore is not necessary to be precise and aligned following the traditional timeline, but allows the author to enjoy spontaneous and dynamic plot development.[456] Furthermore, I think, this memory procures more freedom with the device of "vision" in Ezekiel 8-11. This indeed gives a fresh perspective to approach the apparently time contradictive presentations between chapter 9 and 11. As we have studied, in the eyes of several redactional critical scholars, the twenty-five sun worshippers in the temple area even after the execution in chapter 9 were not compatible in terms of the linear temporal plot development. However, this in-depth study of the genre with the interdisciplinary memory study grants us solution of this problem without amending the text, and the new way to appreciate the text with the fuller dimensions.

Memory is the seat of one's present identity and the lens to see the past. Moreover, with the dynamic power of the narrative, memory can reach the site of foretelling the desired future. The book of Ezekiel, with many unknown reception histories, shows the painful but beautiful compositions of the orchestra of memory.

---

[455] Rickard, *Joyce's Book of Memory*, 12.

[456] Rickard, *Joyce's Book of Memory*, 14.

271

CHAPTER 8. Indeterminacy and Heterotopia from Situated Nowhere

Chapter 8 "Indeterminacy and Heterotopia from Situated Nowhere" is about the temporal and spatial interpretation of the theological reaction of the book of Ezekiel. As a temporal interpretation, first it deals with the violence of the time due to its indeterminacy. The title of 8.1 Indeterminacy and "For a While" suggests the two apparently irrelevant words work together that the *golah* community cannot move in any direction, but lived as if they are situated nowhere. Section 8.2 Entering to the Liminal Status deals both temporal and spatial concerns of Ezekiel 8-11 as well as the book of Ezekiel. The title rather reflects the authorial perspective which encourages its reader to perceive their situation not as the terminal status but the liminal status during which the community and the land prepare and wait for the radical transformation. With nothing is determined, and with the total disconnected feeling, this unlimited openness of the liminality leads characters of the book of Ezekiel to create the ensemble of heterotopias. The last section of Chapter 8, 8.3 From Heterotopia to Heterotopia: Contestation of the Space for Moving YHWH's Sanctuary, therefore, investigates various spaces of the book of Ezekiel, including physical, mental, and writing spaces.

8.1 Indeterminacy and "For a while" מְעַט (11:16)

Indeterminacy means something is not determined. Mark Boda interprets this indeterminacy in the exilic period as the author's strategic "myopia" to let the shocked community members concentrate on dreaming about the hopeful utopia while living in a dystopian situation.[457] But in my reading of the book of Ezekiel, indeterminacy first means the

---

[457] Mark J. Boda, "From Dystopia to Myopia: Utopian (Re)visions in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8," in *Utopia and Dystopia in Prophetic Literature,* ed. Ehud Ben Zvi, (Finnish Exegetical Society, 2006), 248.

violence of time to make one wait forever and ever. The hope to return to the land is given to the *golah* community, and that hope is not a false hope. Often we read that hope comes from YHWH himself through the mouth of the prophet Ezekiel. But time deceives people; time makes everything, including their hope, become scattered in the dust. Only after this acknowledgment and awareness, now I can agree with Boda's opinion and can go further with the book or Ezekiel's indeterminate strategy in his prophecies. This indeterminate holding strategy indeed comes from the survival or enduring efforts in the liminal status, which one is not much encouraged to dream about an immediate return. Eva Mroczek expresses this wish of not much decisive action with an interesting title, "how not to build the temple." In her article, she argues that the Hebrew Bible often suggests somewhat unexpected lifestyles as exemplars, including Jacob and David, as they lived in an ancient time during which the concept of the temple did not exist.[458]

One of the questions that I raised in Introduction was the matter of communication in the book of Ezekiel. I pointed out that the dialogue or interaction problem is not only between Ben Adam and the people but also Ben Adam's not-faithful deliverance of YHWH's commands. Now, I will consult this matter with the identity of Ezekiel the exilic prophet-priest and his strategy in his ministry among his exilic fellows. This discussion will also touch on the meaning of YHWH becoming a sanctuary for the *golah* community for a while in Ezekiel 11:16.

Let us think about what kind of prophet Ezekiel was and why he took that characterization. First, if we think that the prophet of YHWH is generally a messenger of YHWH, the mouthpiece of God, then Ezekiel is not a faithful messenger at all. Even before we discuss what this means and how this matters, Ezekiel did not move to meet the people in many

---

[458] Mroczek, "How Not to Build a Temple," 1-35.

cases. Or more safely speaking, at least the book does not inform us on this matter. As we have seen, the book cannot avoid our suspicion that it attempts to hide the moments of action and reaction. In sum, I would rather abandon this card. At the least, Ezekiel is not a traditionally faithful messenger of God. Then, was Ezekiel a manager since he controlled YHWH's words even though he was commanded? This option comes from the unique presentation of YHWH in the book of Ezekiel. Although it is common that any deity communicates mainly with his or her messenger/intermediator, in the book of Ezekiel that phenomenon is more explicitly described. YHWH often talks about the captives by quoting their thoughts and sayings. By the same token, he gives Ezekiel a direction on how to speak to the people. Strangely enough, however, YHWH never opens "the door of his chamber" to face the exiles, supposedly the most concerning people for him. In the book of Exodus, God also talks only with Moses and Aaron, but he reveals his existence by showing his glory or by performing miracles. And more importantly, the book describes the reactions of the people via descriptions or even direct quotations. What does this difference encourage us to think? How shall we understand this languid old kinglike deity and his clever manager?

There are, however, a few textual indications to apprehend my conclusion that Ezekiel was as a shrewd manager of the spiritless YHWH: Swallowing the scroll in 3:1-3 and the small/temporary sanctuary in 11:16. Both indicators interestingly have some materialization of "immaterial beings," which requires our metaphoric understanding of the text in both cases. If the first indicator (Ezekiel's swallowing scrolls) shows YHWH's prophet-priest, as his servant's mysterious transformation to bear the word of God in the temple-absence community, the second indicator (YHWH's becoming a sanctuary) suggests that YHWH and his dwelling place become mysteriously identical.

Let us begin with the first indicator, "swallowing the scroll." This phrase comes from Ellen Davis' book title. There she emphasizes the transparent characteristic of Ezekiel. Edgar Conrad also argues that Ezekiel is not described as intelligent and emotional but as a mere divine tool under the reign of God. Instead of writing down the vision or word of God, Ezekiel was commanded to swallow the scroll. Once he swallowed the scroll, Ezekiel became filled with the word of God. The word of God is not outside the body of Ezekiel but within Ezekiel's stomach. With this presupposition, Conrad provides several factors to understand Ezekiel as a moving scroll: the tying up of Ezekiel's body with cords as the tying up of the scroll with cords; the clinging of the tongue to the roof of the mouth as the sealing of the scroll by its writer. As though the scroll in which the divine oracle is written would be sent to the people who are waiting for the oracle, as the moving scroll, Ezekiel was sent to the captives.[459] The second indicator is about YHWH becoming a small/temporary sanctuary. In reading 11:16, we need to pay attention to the verb. There, God did not say, "I will allow you the sanctuary" but "I will become (וָאֱהִי לָהֶם) the small/temporary sanctuary" which implies his transformation into the sanctuary in a mysterious way.

As I pointed out in Chapter 6 Structures of Ezekiel 8-11, "sanctuary" is one of the key words or *leitmotifs* in the book of Ezekiel.[460] The title of this section shows my interpretation of the word "מְעַט" is not "small" but "for a while." Although both interpretations are legitimate, [461]

---

[459] Conrad, *Reading the Latter Prophets*, 171-76.

[460] The term מִקְדָּשׁ occurs 29 times in the book of Ezekiel and in most cases it becomes the cause of YHWH's anger and departure as well as the most concering topic in his return.

[461] See for the review, Bustaney Oded, "'Yet I Have Been to Them למקדש מעט in the Countries Where They Have Gone' (Ezekiel 11:16)," in *Sefer Moshe: The Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume, Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism,* ed. C. Cohen, A. Hurvitz, and S. M. Paul (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004) 103-14.

I choose the temporal meaning of duration instead of the spatial term of the size. One of the reasons of my choice is that the text focuses more on educating the exiles to integrate the meaning of Babylonian exile rather than on figuring out the minimized size of YHWH's sanctuary during the exilic period in Babylon. As a thematic motive, "sanctuary" appears throughout the book of Ezekiel.[462] YHWH's rebuke becomes most furious when he condemns the house of Israel for their iniquity of defiling his sanctuary. They are rebellious because they worship other gods especially in his sanctuary. Moreover, Hebrew Bible does not consult the holiness and splendor of YHWH's sanctuary depending on its size and material, but on the presence of YHWH. My temporal interpretation of מְעַט also suggests that the recommendable attitude to live as exiles should be not to expect to return to the land soon, nor to be assimilated to the neighboring culture by abandoning the hope of return. Rather, as we know in the expression of "for a while," one should endure the instability, indeterminacy, and keep having hope without seeing any certain future.

So, when we are looking for the fulfillment of this prophecy, we need to think first about the scroll-bearer Ezekiel as the first candidate. Person's objectification often occurs in the book of Ezekiel. If YHWH as the character becomes a spatial entity as a sanctuary in this verse, 20:14 says that "as aroma, I will be pleased you" (בְּרֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ֙ אֶרְצֶ֣ה אֶתְכֶ֔ם).[463]

And this logic allows us to go further that holy YHWH set up his holy dwelling place in the mind of Ezekiel in the polluted foreign land, not in any other place. Then, once Ezekiel

---

[462] References to YHWH's sanctuary occurs in 5:10, 11; 8:6; 9:6; 11:16; 23:38, 39; 24:21; 37:26; 27:28. YHWH's sanctuary is often named as "holy places," as occurs in 7:24; 21:2.

[463] An interesting study draws my attention in terms of cross-being issues. In this study, Stephen Herring examines passages regarding "Israel as YHWH's image." Stephen L Herring, *Divine Substitution: Humanity as the Manifestation of Deity in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient near East*, FRLANT 247 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 181-208.

moves, he becomes a moving sanctuary so that Ezekiel can always dialogue with God who is within him. Like an Avartar and control tower relationship, YHWH and Ezekiel are working very intimately. Such a relationship is only possible with a passive character like Ezekiel. Then, all the commands including the 90% of unreported/unfulfilled commissions are indeed all written in Ezekiel's mind as God commanded and wait for the time of opening the seal of the scroll, i.e., the time of Ezekiel's tongue set free.

[When we can use the deictic language only]

"Deictic language" refers to words and phrases, such as "me" or "here", that cannot be fully understood without additional contextual information. We see this phenomenon in the postmodern absurdist play, Samuel Becket's *Waiting for Godot*. That play completely and intentionally uses the deictic languages like "here" and "there," "today" and "yesterday," "you" and "I," etc. In most cases, the book of Ezekiel shares the uncertain time of the restoration, but, unlike *Waiting for Godot*, the book is famous for its explicit temporal marks and uses those temporal indications as the beginning mark of units. That means, the time for Ezekiel is progressive, or at least wishes to be progressive; that attitude can break the circular thought that everything is repeated endlessly. The time will come, although it is not certain when it will be.[464]

How much confidence pushed the author of the book to show the temporal remarks in each step? Diachronically, the answer would be easy that the temporal marks are inserted after the times passed; but we may go further synchronically with the present form of the text to ask what kind of rhetorical function would play in these temporal marks.

---

[464] Soo J. Kim, "″Was Ezekiel a Messenger? A Manager? Or a Moving Sanctuary? A Beckettian Reading of the Book of Ezekiel in the Inquiry of the Divine Presence" (paper presented at the annual meeting of Society of Biblical Literature in Atlanta, GA, November, 2015).

Ubiquitous indeterminacy leads the author of the book to use this deictic language when he talks about the hope of return. The situation to use this language ironically shows that the community is indeed "situated nowhere." Once spewed from the homeland, the captives became rootless; everything is uncertain from their identity to their faith toward God. The only certain thing for them is the fact they are waiting, i.e., what they see now is not the whole picture. Everything we encounter is temporal and partial.

In this situation, I interpret that the book of Ezekiel's main purpose is not in calling for repentance. Instead, it encourages its literary audience/implied reader not to determine anything according to their experience now. Something went wrong but it will be fixed soon; therefore, the audience/reader should neither jump into the world of restoration nor lie down in a *sheol*-like desperation, but just sit in the same place. The mission of the book of Ezekiel is to hold people in a designated place, like the place under the tree where Estragon and Vladimir wait in Beckett's play. This place is a heterotopia which Ezekiel and his God made together; this is the center of the hope; but it is also heterotopic for the people in terms of their incomprehensibility of and inability to access God.

Through Ezekiel, the exiled prophet-priest, whose tongue was once stuck up and released, whose hairs were scattered in the air, and whose body was tied up, people surely knew that they had someone who was connected to the supernatural invisible power. One of the catchphrases of the book, "People may know that there was a prophet among them," can be translated, "People may know that there was somebody who embedded the presence of God." Like the fire and storm on Mount Sinai long time ago, we cannot dare to approach the presence of God, but at least we know that something works now by that incomprehensive deity.

8.2 Entering to the Liminal Status

As I mentioned in Part I Introduction, it is hard, through the book of Ezekiel, to catch the lives of captives in Babylon during the 6th century B.C.E. This narrative situation makes the reader look at other comparative sources to get the picture of the community life in crisis-like exile. From this effort, before jumping into the world of Babylonian *golah* community in light of anthropological and social study, I would introduce a sociological model from Sandra Dudley's refugee study *Materializing Exile: Material Culture and Embodied Experience Among Karenni Refugees in Thailand*. Karenni is a Burmese tribal community whose living place has been forcefully replaced in the border of Thailand from their country Burma. I acknowledge that temporal, spatial, religious, and ethnic distances are huge between the two exilic communities— the Burmese exilic community in the modern time, introduced by one scholar's work, and the *golah* community of Ezekiel Ben Adam, introduced in the Hebrew Bible text with the several layers of interpretations. Therefore, making efforts to keep cautious eyes, I will be satisfied with the illustration of my observation on the two communities.

Drawing on extended periods of fieldwork in refugee camps along the Thai–Burmese border, Dudley challenges the traditional assumption of the exile, arguing that displacement is rather a process that produces liminality and mutability.

First, I have paid attention to the usage of their language. As we have studied in Part II, the Book of Ezekiel as a written text shows keen interest in selecting the vocabularies in disputations, verdicts, and apparently ordinary narrations. Among them, I raised some issues with the pronoun usages of "we" "they." and "you," and the use of "Jerusalem" versus "the city" in the form critical analysis study on the text. Moreover, I also pointed out the absence of Babylonian exile related words, of the present sufferings, and of the interactions between people.

These peculiar features of the book have led this present study with the conviction that the

content and the theme of the writing are closely related and reflected in its expressions and

genres. In other words, I have observed so far that all the historical factors have been translated

in the theological and ideological (not between Babylonian empire and the colonized Israelite

exiles) languages and there must be reasons why.

From the observation of the Karenni life, Dudley illustrates the tropes of "inside" and

"outside" as a general means of distinguishing between two geographical areas, Burma and

Thailand. The interesting point is that "all Karenni refugees commonly refer to Karenni State as

'inside' but by implication now perceive themselves as being 'outside'." [465] Moreover, Dudley

points out that the meanings of the terms, "outside" and "inside," have been significantly

modified or have their own connotations, i.e., "inside" which indicated Karenni State now has

the nuance of "sadness, a sense of impotence, or anger."[466]

We have the correspondent example, too, from Ezekiel 11:15. "Far away from YHWH!"

the quoted commanding word of Jerusalemites was the expression of the strong pride in

comparison to the *golah* community whose status is understood as the abandoned and punished

party. However, by picking up this very word of the competitors, and by assigning that word to

the very word from the mouth of YHWH, the text implicitly but strongly enough reinterprets the

subject of the verb "far away" from YHWH.[467] The key to reversing the destinies was YHWH's

---

[465] Sandra H. Dudley, *Materializing Exile: Material Culture and Embodied Experience Among Karenni Refugees in Thailand* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 63.

[466] Dudley, *Materializing Exile*, 64.

[467] Cf. Alejandro F. Botta, "רחק in the Bible: A Re-Evaluation," *Bib* 87 (2006): 418-20; Frank M. Cross, "A Papyrus Recording a Divine Legal Decision and the Root *rḥq* in Biblical and Near Eastern Legal Usage," in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran,* ed. Michael. V. Fox, Victor Avigdor Hurowitz, Avi Hurvitz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 311-20.

promise and proclamation of his becoming a sanctuary with the exiles, as we discussed in the previous section.

Both examples from the Karenni's language use and from Ezekiel 8-11 remind me also of Tuan's argument that human beings are attached to their homeland; but once they are detached, they show apparently incompatible efforts to settle in the new place and situation by changing their name, for example. Nevertheless, they also do not slacken off of their efforts to reconnect (or not to forget) themselves to their past. According to Tuan, Halbwachs' collective memory is and should be changed by the elite leaders of the detached community, who have enough knowledge and experiences of both worlds.

Second, the Karenni's practice of memory gives a glance for the essence of Ezekiel's ministry for the *golah* community. Despite that the Karenni in the camps, during many years of exile in Thailand, cannot grow rice, they still keep the dïy-küy festival, a festival of harvising the rise, and call themselves as rice farmers.[468]

Lastly, it is surprising that I have found the similar key words from Dudley's book that I have found in the book of Ezekiel reading. This is noteworthy to cite here:

> It is sometimes argued that life in a refugee camp is in a sense a life in suspension, **caught in a liminal time and place, focused on the past and the future but not the present**, ethnography of which is thus inherently limited and partial. Yet, refugee camp life is also a rich pageant in itself, worthy of serious ethnographic enquiry both as a way of life and in terms of its marginal relationship to the places whence informants came.[469]

Now, with this understanding of the life of exile, let us go back to our text. Although we can enumerate almost unlimited liminal statuses or situations, I will deal with the three most

---

[468] Dudley, *Materializing Exile*, 139.

[469] Dudley, *Materializing Exile*, xiii. Emphasis is mine.

obvious liminal spaces: 1) Ben Adam's body as a scroll bearer; 2) House of Ben Adam; and 3) the book as the liminal space to hold the divine revelation. We have already studied the first case, the meaning of the scroll bearer, in the previous section. First, Ben Adam's body is an important space as the place of holding the scroll. As we see in Conrad's logic, as a scroll, Ben Adam was treated to be tied up and be sealed until the time comes to open him. This makes Ben Adam experience indeterminate liminality in his lifetime. Moreover, if one agrees with my suggestion that YHWH's chosen place in his becoming a sanctuary would be Ben Adam's body, the priest-prophet becomes like the holy of holies of the Jerusalem temple. With this logic, Ben Adam's house acts like the entrance of Tent of Meeting in Pentateuch, where people of Israel came to ask Moses the divine will. This new spatial meaning on the ordinary house, which I will discuss in the next section, with the liminality of Ben Adam's house, is related to the two indicators. Regarding the first indicator, the scroll should wait until the author of the scroll commands it to open. Regarding the second indicator, YHWH's sanctuary will depart from Ben Adam's mental space to the actual place in the Land of Israel. But until that time, Ben Adam bears the sanctuary during this liminal time. His body also becomes a liminal space because he has a physical body that may be touched by unclean things and people. As Sweeney points out that the priest is the mediator who crosses the sacred and profane,[470] Ben Adam must have experienced this duty seriously, being surrounded by the polluted world and becoming the embodiment of YHWH's sanctuary.

What shall Ben Adam do while he is waiting for the day of hope? What can he do with the "rebellious" house of Israel? What can he do with the deity who has spoken so many words concerning the past and the future but not about the present, and who always speaks in the deictic

---

[470] Sweeney, "Ezekiel: Zadokite Priest and Visionary Prophet of the Exile," 125-44.

language but never makes him overcome the indeterminacy? The book of Ezekiel is the product

of this endurance of liminality. The book of Ezekiel, writing of the exilic period, is written by the

one who becomes a scroll bearer and a tent keeper of YHWH's sanctuary in the situated nowhere.

Maybe the real question that Ezekiel the exiled priest-prophet kept might be not a question of

"How long, O Lord shall we wait?" but "How long can we last in this waiting without

disappearing ourselves into the dust?"

8.3 From Heterotopia to Heterotopia: Contestation of the Space for Moving YHWH's Sanctuary

So far, we have studied Ezekiel 8-11 with the form critical analysis, discourse analysis,

spatial theory, and intertextual readings. With the help of various methodologies, we have

recognized that the first temple vision is interested in one task: moving YHWH's sanctuary to

where the *golah* community is situated. Even if the captives felt that they were situated nowhere,

the text claims that the very space of nowhere will become a sacred space, a space of hope, and a

space of transformation. The title of this section "from Heterotopia" reflects this nowhere

situation of the captives. Detachment from one's hometown means for the ancient people the

death of one's past and the experience of the heterotopia of crisis, as we have seen in Foucault's

concept. If this happened to people who were raised in a strong religious tradition throughout

their lifetime, the desperation from the heterotopic chaos must be inexpressibly huge. The only

way of survival and making a life meaningful would be creating another heterotopia and

communicating within that heterotopia. The second phrase in the title of this section "to

heterotopia" intends to reflect this effort of the *golah* community.

The first heterotopia, "situated in Babylon" is relatively simple because it comes from

the recognition of otherness. This first heterotopia therefore works as the source of the variously

manifested second level of heterotopias. It includes the treatment of Babylon as non-existence;

the land of oppressor as a training place like the wilderness of their ancestors in their collective memory; the ordinary exile's house as a place of divine revelation; self-awareness of divine-embodiment; and finally a newly selected location for YHWH's sanctuary.

Let us begin with what actually text tells about these issues.

8.3.1 Discrepancy between literary reality and literary conceptions

The most significant discrepancy in reading Ezekiel 8-11 is the fact that the Jerusalem temple is not destroyed in the vision. The temple site was defiled and abandoned and the temple personnel were expelled and slaughtered, but temple structures were not completely destroyed. More precisely saying, it was never commanded in the first temple vision. Indeed, we cannot find any kind of expression that the temple was destroyed throughout the book of Ezekiel. The book of Isaiah, which shows a strong Zion theology, also demonstrates the suffering of Israelites by YHWH's hiding face rather than the destruction of the temple structure. From the account of Ezra-Nehemiah, we can confirm that the temple structure did not remain in the postexilic era; and according to the archeological data, it was destroyed. But its destruction is not in the book of Ezekiel. The gap between the impression that we readers get from our casual reading of the text and the actual presentation of the text is not limited to the temple "destruction" matter.

In the literary reality even in the book of Ezekiel, there are the surviving people in Jerusalem, as we see a fugitive from Jerusalem appear in 33:21. But in the conceptual recognition, the land is now rested, i.e., the book of Ezekiel employs "the empty land myth" of the book of Jeremiah that there are no survivors in the land. Accordingly, when Ben Adam traveled in the hand of YHWH in Ezekiel 40, the possible scenery would be only that temple structure remaining among artificial constructions; no human beings are left; all territorial boundaries are now gone so need to be remarked. From this example, we learn how the

284

collective memory powerfully works in the homogeneous community. We have studied this matter also from the Further Study "Ahaz and Manasseh Win Over Hezekiah and Manasseh." The temple structure and the decorations which Ben Adam found in the temple tour were indeed hard to match with the contemporary of Ezekiel but were found in many parallels with the distant past, within the wicked kings' deeds in the collective memory. Ben Zvi encourages us to understand the manifestation of the both collective and cultural memory not as a way of straightforward application but very creative or even complicated, as an unexpected outcome is produced from various sites of memory.[471]

If these are the two differing pictures of the literary presentation and conception of the land of Israel and Jerusalem, the concept of Babylon in the book of Ezekiel is also different from the general assumption of the typical colonizing oppressor. In my reading of the book of Ezekiel, Babylonia often has the double function as the land of oppression and impurity which the house of Israel should escape and as the wilderness itself in terms of the preparatory transitional space. When the book of Ezekiel often presents utopia and dystopia to its literary audience, the physical space, Babylon, suddenly disappears and even transforms into a wilderness. This is a very different picture from the Pentateuchal presentations on Egypt and the wilderness, since in the books of Exodus through Numbers, the land of bondage and the wilderness are clearly distinct. But in the Babylonian exile, as we see in the restoration process, there was no wilderness period before returning (actually I should say it would be the first entering to the land for the next generation rather than returning) to the land of Israel. Philip Davies also argues that we need to associate with the wilderness concept too when we think of Babylon and the Babylonian exile.

---

[471] Ehud Ben Zvi, "The Study of Forgetting and the Forgotten in Ancient Israelite Discourse/s: Observations and Test Cases'," in *Cultural Memory in Biblical Exegesis,* ed. Pernille Carstens, Trine Hasselbalch, and Niels Peter Lemche, Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and its Contexts 17 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2012) 155–74.

Relevant to the present study, Davies understands the wilderness period "as a past utopia or dystopia."[472]

The reality is that they are now in Babylon as captives. But, as we have seen, Babylon is never elaborately depicted in the book of Ezekiel. We do not know about the daily lives of the exiles nor the various topographies of their region, because the author avoids those depictions. However, we are introduced to the scenery of Jerusalem at that time and the daily lives of Jerusalemites. Likewise, we readers are invited to experience what Ben Adam experienced with the new temple and the new city in his vision. Of course, now we know that both scenes do not match with the other biblical references and those are rather from the memory and expectation. This memory and expectation work together and make possible heterotopia. It is not the single heterotopia but multiple ones. This is a very strong survival tool.

My observations and analyses on Ezekiel 8-11 suggest many possibilities for extended studies with various, contemporary socio-scientific theories, and among them, the most correspondent appears to be the collective or social memory studies. As I quoted in Chapter 4, a recent edited volume, *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination* provides us with fruitful insights about the question of the relationship between the formation of the biblical texts and the social memory/imagination. Editors' findings are worthy of our special notice for our reading of the book of Ezekiel:

> Memory studies recognize that facts relating to selected events and experiences
> are quickly lost in early stages of social memory in the process of their being

---

[472] Philip R. Davies, "The Wilderness Years: Utopia and Dystopia in the Book of Hosea," in *Utopia and Dystopia in the Prophetic Literature*, 160.

transformed into images and concepts and arranged into stories to facilitate their recall within the group.[473]

As we have seen through Halbwachs' and Tuan's studies, once the shaken memories and identities are reformulated, that re-identity remains stable until the next wave would come to shake that new identity. My interest here is the power of narrative, in which the templates or concepts of our social memory and expectations are all integrated. This "template" or "concept" well correspond to the basic underlying concept that Knierim argues, is hidden under the surface level of the text and requires interpreters' additional efforts to seek for.

The discrepancy between the literary presentation and the literary reality in the book of Ezekiel and in the prophetic books in general makes us understand it as one of the strategies of prophetic literature; and the strategic purpose is to make readers reread these books with the enriched messages of hope. In the present study of Ezekiel 8-11, its literary presentation is different from the reality in two ways; the temple structure is not destroyed; only the people who practiced abominable things in the temple were smitten. By defiling the temple, by removing the people and the idols all together from the temple, and by showing YHWH's departure from his own sanctuary, the land of Israel is now at rest as in a liminal status, waiting for the complete renovation. In the similar vein, the form of the eye-witness vision account the chapters employ as its presenting device works as a kind of liminality since it waits for Ezekiel 40-48, the fulfillment of the vision.

As a last topic of this section, I would raise a question about the avoidance of "here" matter. From the first reading of the book of Ezekiel, its fantastic and metaphoric devices of storytelling appear so arresting that sober-minded work of finding the meaning of the text can be

---

[473] Diana Vikander Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi, introduction to *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), xviii.

interrupted, and readers are lost their way of reading due to either complexity or unintelligibility of the narrative. However, in our further reading, even abstract or trivial descriptions that readers' consciousness can easily dismiss because of its unintelligibility or banality are closely linked to the significant messages the book wants to deliver such as its theological agenda and understanding of the exile. In Ezekiel, three things to consider: 1) the understanding of exile; 2) the understanding of the liminal status; and 3) the understanding of the land of Israel. While Ezekiel proposes totally new conceptions to these, it reveals bits and pieces of why it avoids "here" matter. First, the author of the book of Ezekiel makes an attempt to break the strong association of the two ideas, i.e., the exile, and demise and abandonment. Yes, going into exile is detachment from the homeland on one hand and from their deity on the other; but as we have seen in the Ezekiel 8-11 study, the death sentence is not given to the *golah* community but to the parties of those who remained in the land. The exilic life is therefore analogous to Jonah who was swallowed by the big fish in the book of Jonah. Just as Jonah could survive from the fate of drowning by being sheltered inside the big fish, the *golah* community could survive from the wrath of God by being expelled to a foreign land. Although the stomach of the fish in which Jonah should endure was a filthy place, that is the safest place for Jonah unless YHWH changed his mind and would command the fish to spit Jonah out. It would be a similar compositional strategy between the two texts: the space inside the fish is tacitly transformed into the wilderness-like exilic space; by the same token, the abstract and distant sense to the Babylonian empire makes it possible for the author of the book of Ezekiel to reshape the space as the wilderness-like liminal space and even to envision the new space of restoration. Therefore, both spaces should not be graphically depicted; i.e, "here" rejects the weight onto itself. On the

288

contrary, like the light and dark side of one object, all harsh criticisms go on to the land of Israel and its dwellers in various prophetic future forms, as I named "making Jerusalem a dystopia."

8.3.2 Seat of Image of Jealousy, Seat of Honor, and YHWH's Moving Sanctuary

In searching for the identity of the seat of image of jealousy in Ezek. 8:3, we have confirmed that there are many candidates for this but nothing is certain. The jealous image could be the victory stele from king Nebuchadnezzar or any monument to remember kings in honor, or even royal tombs nearby the temple precinct. A more important function of this jealous image was that it provokes YHWH's jealousy and makes him remove his sanctuary from the Jerusalem temple. Whatever the reality was, this presentation portrays that site as a dystopia and that dystopia making itself creates a heterotopia for the *golah* community. Moreover, the book of Ezekiel carefully designs to show the counterpart of this place as the utopian restoration in the final vision. By returning to the same spot—although the text intentionally avoids the identical place between the site of the old Jerusalem temple and the site of the new temple—YHWH recovers his honor. I will call therefore the returning spot, through the east gate of the temple, a seat of honor, as a counterpart of the former seat of the jealous image. Between the two events, the theme of our text, YHWH moving his sanctuary, exists. Thus, the moving can be summarized as YHWH abandoning his former seat, because it becomes the seat of the jealous image. Departure of the king of kings in his anger means all the death in it. When the time comes, the king will return but during the meantime, he will move to the strange place where people create heterotopias.

8.3.3 Vision, its freedom and power

The choice of the form of vision or vision report must be a very wise compositional strategy since this genre does not call for the audience in public. Although the author wanted to

work as a vision reporter, it employs the secretly telling his own vision. It is at least at the first

level, a self-satisfactory writing. According to a cognitive psychologist Endel Tulving, human

beings have two main types of human memory systems: "semantic" and "episodic."[474] If the

former as the rational network is used in the realistic presentations (most prophetic speeches) in

the book of Ezekiel, this episodic memory is used in the vision narrative by clothing the

framework of eyewitness genre.

As Davis elaborates, the prophet who swallowed the scroll now got swallowed up by the

world of the text he wrote. Unlike the situation of chapters 8-11 vision, in front of the elders at

his house, the last temple vision must visit the prophet very privately so that nobody can share

when the vision occurred. Nonetheless, when the vision is written down and is proclaimed or

read, the audience or readers are invited to join or to become one of the recipients, i.e., a virtual

spectator. I am very aware of difference between narrator and narratee, but in the situation like

Ezekiel 40-48, in which the reporter as spectator or just a receptacle of the divine speech is

finally absorbed or disappears, we may think that the implied reader should come up at least to

the position of the spectator, if not the position of the reporter or narrator.

The book of Ezekiel reflects the work of scribal editors who used the same tactics of the

prophetic literature. Its literary structure as a series of reports in largely chronological order,

under the guise of first-person speech, is a seductive artifice. "Whatever core of oracles derived

from a prophet named Ezekiel, the book ironically eclipses him."[475] With this strategy, I think,

the book of Ezekiel could avoid or at least make a minimum of the effects of "unreliable

narrator's narration." With so strong and explicit genre as vision and a form of diary with the

---

[474] Endel Tulving, *Elements of Episodic Memory*, Oxford Psychology Series 2 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983), 381-403.

[475] Ronald L. Troxel, *Prophetic Literature: From Oracles to Books* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 239.

temporal and spatial indications, the readers should agree as they enter that it is the vision and Ezekiel's personal experience. In other words, readers also start reading this series of the story as the unreliable narration. But at the same time, they practice what Samuel Coleridge's coined term "suspension of disbelief"[476] as they ask themselves, what if this would be real? All the choices that the book of Ezekiel employs in terms of narrative devices are to serve for this survival of the narrator.

8.3.4 Living in the Two Spaces

One of the conspicuous aspects of heterotopia lies in its simultaneous and multi-dimensional features. Anne Dvinge in her study of the Candace Allen's novel Valaida names this coming together of the senses as "synesthesia" in terms of heterotopia's real and unreal senses relating the concept of utopia.[477] Likewise, the heterotopia has a great capacity and flexibility to collocate several incompatible spaces in one real place like a Japanese garden or a Persian carpet. The sacred space of the traditional Persian garden as the microcosmic rectangle representing the whole world embraces all the four, heterotopic parts of the world. Positioned at its center is the more sacred space, another heterotopia with the water fountain the life for all the vegetation in the garden, as the navel of the world. Simultaneity observed in this picture is a moderate version of coexistence of heterotopias whose differences vary but in a lesser degree.

Meanwhile, Ezekiel 8 proposes a radical simultaneity to subsume the two diametrically antithetical heterotopias under it: sacredness and profanity. Specifically, profanity and defilement

---

[476] Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria* (1817), ed. Nigel Leask (London: J. M. Dent, 1997).

[477] Anne Dvinge, "Keeping Time, Performing Place: Jazz Heterotopia in Candace Allen's Valaida," *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 4, no. 2 (2012): 1-19, 1. Cf. Michel Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," *Diacritics: A Review of Contemporary Criticism* 16, no. 1 (1986): 23.

of idolatries are coexisting with proper worship within the sacred and holy space. How is this idea possible? Like Foucault before him, Said goes on to make this transgression of conceptual boundaries explicitly spatial. "Most people are principally aware of one culture, one setting, one home," he says; "exiles are aware of at least two, and this plurality of vision gives rise to an awareness of simultaneous dimensions."[478] This description of a plurality or simultaneity of places or settings seems correlative with Foucault's definition of the heterotopia, in both "Les Hétérotopies" and "Of Other Spaces" as "a simultaneously mythic and real contestation of the space in which we live."[479] In Part III, this notion is also unpacked as the liminality and more extended as the concept of indeterminacy.

Mysteriously, heterotopia is governed by the unfamiliar opening and closing principles: Heterotopias premise isolation and inviolableness for each space; entering an individual space is not open to all. Even when a heterotopia appears to welcome any, we can find a hidden rule of exclusion. In Ezekiel 40-48, unlike Isaiah 56-66 which shows both inclusion and exclusion in the postexilic community picture, the vision of Ezekiel appears not to exclude anybody. But in fact, once we enter the world of the vision, we find that the Levites are criticized; kings are criticized; and only the Zadokite priests are reserved in the high rank. In this case, the heterotopia opens its door to everybody but not without a reason. Then, heterotopia open to all becomes a false belief or delusion; in fact, the word "enter" presumes our primary exclusion, being situated "outside" of the heterotopia, in order to "enter" it. In Ezekiel 8-11, this moment of entering other space appears in Ben Adam's act of digging the hole of the wall. This special action can be interpreted in the eyes of Foucault as the opening of the secret world.

---

[478] Edward W. Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 186.

[479] Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," 4.

Finally, one of the most important notions of heterotopia lies in its resistance. It is the heterotopia of resistance against two places: one against Jerusalem and the other against Babylon. Recent readings and representations of heterotopias focus on the potential for the re-inventing or re-organizing of social order. For example, Margaret Kohn discusses "the heterotopia of resistance."[480] Especially, when the text deals with the polemic against Jerusalem and its dwellers, the text shows a power relation using the heterotopic notion. Clearly, spaces of deviation, such as the prison or the mental hospital, demonstrate the power of one group over another. It seems to me that readings of heterotopias, as either utopian sites of resistance or as disruptions of utopia, both tend to avoid explaining the power relations but showing the product itself from memory and imagination. Clearly, spaces of deviation, such as the prison or the mental hospital, demonstrate the power of one group over another without providing further explanation how and why the present structure was possible and reasonable.

---

[480] Margaret Kohn, "The Power of Place: The House of the People as Counterpublic," *Polity* 33, no. 4 (2001): 508.

CHAPTER 9 Answers for the questions in Introduction

Now, it is time to answer for the questions that I set up in Introduction.

1. Let us begin with the literary context of Ezekiel 8-11. Can we find any significant pattern between chapters 4-7 as the previous unit of Ezekiel 8-11 and chapter 12 as its subsequent unit? How does the book of Ezekiel relate the prophetic presentations and the first temple vision in its formal structure?

We have seen that Ezekiel 8-11 is one of the multiple presentations in terms of foretelling of the fall of Jerusalem. If the surrounding sub-units show the divine commands to deliver the content in the form of sign-act performances with the subsequent prophecies, our text, the first temple vision, shows the same content in the visionary context. Ironically, as we confirmed, only the vision part has the report of the deliverance.

2. How much can we find parallels between the Jerusalem temple in Ezekiel 8 and the one in the book of Kings? With whose era can we most match the pictures? Is the temple picture of Ezekiel 8 close to Zedekiah's time? Josiah's time? Or Hezekiah's? How about the times of Ahaz and Manasseh?

We have observed that the landscape of the Jerusalem temple in Ezekiel 8 does not match well Ezekiel's contemporary era, the time of King Zedekiah. Rather, with the help of Collective Memory theory, it would come from the exiled priest Ben Adam's memory or from the collective memory of the *golah* community. This presentation based on the collective memory of the time of King Ahaz and of King Manasseh shows the author's post-event diagnosis on the national crisis. Within the larger context, those problems set up in the first temple vision have been mostly solved in the final temple vision.

3. What would be the ultimate goal of making Jerusalem a dystopia? How would it work for the *golah* community, the literary and implied audience of Ben Adam the narrator?

As we have studied, the ultimate goal of making Jerusalem a dystopia lies in transforming the mindset of the *golah* community concerning their identities and the exile. It first breaks the "wrongly" directed nostalgia toward Jerusalem. It is break of the long-time myth of Jerusalem, YHWH's chosen place to dwell.

4. How shall we understand the structure of Ezekiel 9, 10, and 11? If those three chapters show the multiple presentations on the divine executions, for what effect is the text so concentrated on presenting the destruction of the city and the defilement of the temple?

The previous structural analysis concludes that those three chapters, after the accusation and judgment were made in Ezekiel 8, repeatedly present of the fall of Jerusalem in multiple perspectives. However, this is not just a repetition but progression with the spiral structure. The fall of Jerusalem is one of the gravest concerns among the *golah* community. The restricted condition of the *golah* community, in which they could know about hometown only by listening to the news, must have increased their tantalizing curiosity.

5. What shall we learn from the scene of the elders sitting before Ezekiel the priest-prophet? Is there any social setting (*Sitz im Leben*) that we can connect?

The possible social setting of the elders' sitting in Ezekiel's house can be the divine inquiry concerning very important issues of the community or nation. In this case, we do not know the content of the inquiry, but the main stories of the vision suggest that their inquiry and

the main interests of the text are not so different: What will be YHWH's decision in this national

crisis? Can we return to the land, if yes, when?

6. What is the meaning of YHWH's proclamation to become himself a "sanctuary" to the exilic community in Ezekiel 11:16? How effectively does the concept of moving YHWH's sanctuary work in the book of Ezekiel? How could it be possible that the holy God of Israel dwell in the polluted foreign land?

In the traditional notion, it is impossible that the holy God of Israel settles his dwelling

place in the polluted foreign land, especially in the land of his people's oppressor. But, the book

of Ezekiel introduces a very radical notion of YHWH's mobility as well as YHWH's freedom to

choose his dwelling place. As we have seen, the new place of YHWH's sanctuary in Chaldea

was implicitly revealed as the body of Ben Adam the exilic priest-prophet. In other words,

Ezekiel with the generic name Ben Adam becomes an example to the *golah* community to show

how to embrace the exile in their lifetime. Ideologically, moving YHWH's sanctuary was the

main project of the text so that the *golah* community wins over the Jerusalem leftovers.

7. How shall we understand the shift of YHWH's attitude towards the elders of Judah in the *golah* community from the first temple vision (Ezekiel 8-11) to the subsequent prophecies in Ezekiel 14 and 20? What does the omniscient character YHWH see from the elders while readers cannot know anything? Why does the harsh criticism which YHWH poured out onto the Jerusalemites in Ezekiel 8-11 move to the elders of the *golah* community?

This is not clear from the text reading only, but we can tell that the first temple vision is a

unique place where the *golah* community, explicitly distinguished from the other party,

Jerusalemites, receives the favorite spot from YHWH. It also suggests that Ezekiel 8-11 is the

critical transition point in the book of Ezekiel to separate the two competitive parties. If I use the language of Jeremiah, the first temple vision is the text to tell that the *golah* community is the good fruit, not the Jerusalemites despite their strong claims.

8. Why, "there and before," and "there and later," instead of "here and now with you"?

This question can be answered in several ways, but I would point out here two things. First, as we have seen in Chapter 8, the exile is the unavoidable option of the preparation for the future life. If exile is not the end of one's life but should be understood as a training period, the life in Babylonia should be also durable. If it is depicted too harshly, then escape from the situation would be the natural outcome which is not the agenda of the book of Ezekiel. In this context, suffering in Babylon should not be graphically described, but remain in the abstract and vague manner. By suppressing the desire of depiction "now and here" matter in Babylon, the author of the book successfully achieves his goal to kill Jerusalem.

Second, the present of the literary audience was filled with indeterminacy in the liminal status. Even if they repent, even if they start worshipping their deity only, the human initiative efforts can bring not one practical change to their lives. Their exilic life will end only when the divine initiative starts. In this situation, the best enduring strategy would be rethinking the past to recreate the future.

9. How shall our reading attitude affect our understanding of the text, if we keep in mind that we read Ezekiel 8-11, the vision report/fantasy, not the historical narrative? How shall we explain this irony that readers see the most active scene in the vision? And how shall we understand the other worldliness of the vision which reveals the secret of the inaccessible space?

Reading Ezekiel 8-11 as a vision narrative does not exclude its historicity. With the frame of the visionary genre, the text reflects and reinterprets various historical events including the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonian invasion. The point is that the theological interpretation itself works as the ministry of the exilic prophet for his community. In this context, writing a vision and reading/listening that vision are both creating heterotopia in their desperate situation. This is not so different from our living strategy.

10. Finally, to what degree, can we apply the term Heterotopia in reading the presentations in Ezekiel 8-11 and more generally in the book of Ezekiel?

I read our text as creating heterotopias. First, it worked as an escape from the given heterotopia in the land of Chaldea. Then, making Jerusalem a dystopia worked in a double sense to cut-off the nostalgia of the *golah* community as well as to build the new meaning of their exilic life. Not the renowned places like Jerusalem or Babylon, but the ordinary hopeless places such as a valley, Chaber canal, and one priest-prophet's house become the transformative and sacred place. With this notion of creating heterotopias, the other two terms, nostalgia and dystopia, can be fully understood. By the same token, the utopian presentation concerning the restoration in the final vision also can be understood as exiles' tenaciously creating a heterotopia.

Bibliography

Abbot, H. Porter. *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative*. 2nd edition. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, [2002] 2008.

Aichele, George and Gary A. Philips. "Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis." *Semeia* 69/70 (1995): 7-18.

Albright, William F. *Archaeology and the Religions of Israel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1956.

---------. *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra.* Torchbooks 02. New York: Harpercollins,1963.

Allen, Leslie C. *Ezekiel 1-19* WBC 28. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1994.

---------. *Ezekiel 20-48.* WBC 29. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990.

Alster, Bendt. "Tammuz." In *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 2nd extensively rev. edition. Edited by K. Van Der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter Willem van der Horst, 51. Leiden; Boston: Grand Rapids: Brill; Eerdmans, 1999.

Andersen, Francis I. *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton, 1974.

Aster, Shawn Zelig. "Ezekiel's Adaptation of Mesopotamian Melammu." *Die Welt des Orients* 45, no. 1 (2015): 10-21.

Bal, Mieke and Christine Van Boheemen. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative.* 3rd edition. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 2009. Originally published as *De theorie van vertellen en verhalen.* Muiderberg, The Netherlands: Coutinho, 1980.

---------. "The Laughing Mice-or: On Focalization" *Poetics Today* 2, no. 2 (1981): 202-10.

Bar-Efrat, Simon. *Narrative Art in the Bible.* JSOTSup 70. Bible and Literature Series 17. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Barmash, Pamela. "Out of the Mists of History: The Exaltation of the Exodus in the Bible." In *Exodus in the Jewish Experience: Echoes and Reverberations.* Edited by Pamela Barmash and W. David Nelson, 1-22. New York: Lexington Books, 2015.

Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." In *Image, Music, Text*. Edited by Roland Barthes and Stephen Heath, 142-48. New York: Hill & Wang, 1977.

---------. *The Rustle of Language*. Translated by Richard Howard. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

---------. *Writing Degree Zero.* Translated by Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. London: Jonathan Cape, 1967.

Barton, John. *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study.* 2nd edition. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1996.

Becker, Joachim. "Ez 8-11 als einheitliche Komposition in einem pseudepigraphischen Ezechielbuch." In *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation.* Edited by Johan Lust, 136-50. BETL 74. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.

Behrens, Achim. *Prophetische Visionsschilderungen im Alten Testament: Sprachliche Eigenarten, Funktion und Geschichte einer Gattun.* AOAT 292. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "The Concept of Prophetic Books." In *The Production of Prophecy: Constructing Prophecy and Prophets in Yehud.* Edited by Diana Vikander Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi, 73-85. London: Equinox, 2009.

---------. *Micah.* FOTL 21B. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

---------. "The Prophetic Book: A Key Form of Prophetic Literature." In *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century.* Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Marvin A. Sweeney, 276-97. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

---------. "The Study of Forgetting and the Forgotten in Ancient Israelite Discourse/s: Observations and Test Cases'." In *Cultural Memory in Biblical Exegesis.* Edited by Pernille Carstens, Trine Hasselbalch, and Niels Peter Lemche, 155-74. Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and its Contexts 17. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2012.

---------. Ed. *Utopia and Dystopia in Prophetic Literature. Helsinki:* Finnish Exegetical Society, 2006.

Benwell, Benthan, James Procter, and Gemma Robinson. "Introduction." In *Postcolonial Audiences: Readers, Viewers and Reception.* Edited by Benthan Benwell, James Procter, and Gemma Robinson. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Bergmann, Claudia D. *Childbirth as a Metaphor for Crisis: Evidence from the Ancient Near East, the Hebrew Bible, and 1QH XI. 1-18.* BZAW 382. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Bergsma, John Sietze. "The Biblical Manumission Laws: Has the Literary Dependence of H on D Been Demonstrated?" In *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam.* Edited by Eric F. Mason et. al., 65-92. JSJSup 153. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

---------. "The Jubilee: A Post-Exilic Priestly Attempt to Reclaim Lands?" *Bib.* 84 (2003): 225-46.

---------. *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation.* VTSup 115. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

---------. "The Temple as 'Built Jubilee' in Ezekiel." *Proceedings of the Eastern Great Lakes and Midwestern Biblical Societies* 24 (2004): 75-85 [appeared in Winter 2005].

Berlin, Adele. *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative.* Bible and Literature Series 9. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983.

Berquist, Jon L. "Critical Spatiality and the Uses of Theory." In *Constructions of Space I: Theory, Geography and Narrative*. Edited by Claudia V. Camp and Jon L. Berquist, 1-12. LHB/OTS 481. Edinburgh, New York: T & T Clark International, 2007.

---------. "Spaces of Jerusalem." In *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*. Edited by Jon L. Berquist and Claudia V. Camp, 40-52. New York; London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2008.

Betts, J. Terry. *Ezekiel the Priest: A Custodian of Tôrâ.* New York: Peter Lang, 2005.

Bevan, Robert. *The Destruction of Memory: Architecture at War.* London: Reaktion Books, 2006.

Bishai, Linda S. *Forgetting Ourselves: Secession and (Im)Possiblity of Territorial Identity.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2004.

Block, Daniel I. "Divine Abandonment: Ezekiel's Adaptation of an Ancient Near Eastern Motif." In *Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong, 15-42. SBL SymS 9. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2000.

---------. *Ezekiel 1-24.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

---------. *Gods of the Nations: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern National Theology.* ETSMS 2. Jackson: Evangelical Theological Society, 1988.

Boadt, Lawrence. *Ezekiel's Oracles against Egypt: A Literary and Philological Study of Ezekiel 29-32.* BibOr 37. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980.

Boda, Mark J. "From Dystopia to Myopia: Utopian (Re)visions in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8." In *Utopia and Dystopia in Prophetic Literature*. Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi, 210-48. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2006.

---------, Michael H. Floyd, and Colin M. Toffelmire. Eds. *The Book of the Twelve and the New Form Criticism*. Ancient Near East Monographs 10. Atlanta: SBL, 2015.

Bodi, Daniel. *The Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra*. OBO 104. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

---------. "The Double Current and the Tree of Healing in Ezekiel 47:1-12 in Light of Babylonian Iconography and Texts." *Die Welt des Orients* 45, no. 1 (2015): 22-37.

Bond, Lucy. *Frames of Memory after 9/11: Culture, Criticism, Politics, and Law*. Palgrave Macmilian Memory Studies. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1961.

Botta, Alejandro F. "רחק in the Bible: A Re-Evaluation." *Bib* 87 (2006): 418-20.

Bowen, Nancy. *Ezekiel*. Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 2010.

Broome, Edwin C. "Ezekiel's Abnormal Personality." *JBL* 65 (1946): 277-92.

Brown, Tom. *Breaking the Fourth Wall: Direct Address in the Cinema*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

Brownlee, William H. *Ezekiel 1-19*. WBC 19. Waco: Word Books, 1986.

Buber, Martin. *Der Glaube der Propheten*. Werke II: Schriften zur Bibel. München und Heidelberg: Kösel und Lambert Schneider, 1964.

Camp, Claudia V. "Oralities, Literacies, and Colonialisms in Antiquity and Contemporary Scholarship." In *Orality, Literacy, and Colonialism in Antiquity*. Edited by Jonathan A. Draper, 193-217. *Semeia Studies* 47. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2004.

---------. "Storied Space, or, Ben Sira 'Tells' a Temple," in *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social, and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan*. Edited by David M. Gunn and P. M. McNutt, 64-80. JSOTSup 359. Sheffiled: Sheffiled Academic, 2002.

Campbell, Antony F. and Mark A. O'Brien, *Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introductions, Annotations*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Campbell, W. Gordon. *Reading Revelation: A Thematic Approach*. First published in French in 2007. First published in English in 2012. Cambridge: England: James Clarke and Co. 2012.

Carley, Keith W. *Ezekiel among the Prophets: A Study of Ezekiel's Place in Prophetic Tradition*. Studies in Biblical Theology 31. Naperville: A. R. Allenson, 1975.

Carr, David M. *Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

---------. "Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence: An Empirical Test of Criteria Applied to Exodus 34, 11-26 and Its Parallels." In *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Ex 32-34 und Dtn 9-10*. Edited by Matthias Kockert and Erhard Blum, 107-40. *Veroffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft fur Theologie* 18. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001.

---------. *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

---------. "Torah on the Heart: Literary Jewish Textuality within Its Ancient Near Eastern Context." *Oral Tradition* 25 (2010): 17-39.

Casad, Eugene H. "Seeing It in More Than One Way." In *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World*, Edited by John R. Taylor and Robert E. MacLaury, 23-50. Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995.

Chatman, Seymour Benjamin. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.

Chyutin, Michael. *Architecture and Utopia in the Temple Era.* New York: T&T Clark, 2006.

Clements, Ronald. E. "The Chronology of Redaction in Ez 1-24." In *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*. Edited by Johan Lust, 159-69. BETL 74. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.

Cohen, Mark E. *The Cultic Calendars of the Ancient Near East*. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1993.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. *Biographia Literaria* (1817). Editied by Nigel Leask. London: J. M. Dent, 1997.

Connerton, Paul. "Seven Types of Forgetting." *Memory Studies* 1 (2008): 59-60.

Conrad, Edgar. *Reading the Latter Prophets: Toward A New Canonical Criticism.* JSOTSup 376. London: T&T Clark International, 2004

Cook, Stephen L. *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.

---------. "The Shocking Severance from Sheol of Ezekiel's Utopia." Paper presented at Theological Perspectives of the Book of Ezekiel in the annual meeting for the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA, November 21-24, 2015.

Cooke, George. Albert. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936.

Cross, Frank M. "A Papyrus Recording a Divine Legal Decision and the Root *rḥq* in Biblical and Near Eastern Legal Usage." In *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran.* Edited by Michael. V. Fox, Victor Avigdor Hurowitz, Avi Hurvitz, 311-20. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996.

Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.* 5th edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.

Davies, Philip R. "The Wilderness Years: Utopia and Dystopia in the Book of Hosea." In *Utopia and Dystopia in the Prophetic Literature.* Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi, 160-74. Helsinki: Göttingen: Finnish Exegetical Society. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

Davis, Ellen F. *Swallowing the Scroll: Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel's Prophecy*. JSOTSup 78. Bible and Literature series, 213. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989.

Derrida, Jacques. "Force and Signification." *Writing and Difference*. Translated by Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

---------. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

Dudley, Sandra H. *Materializing Exile: Material Culture and Embodied Experience among Karenni Refugees in Thailand.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.

Durkheim, Emile. "From The Elementary Forms of Religious Life." Excerpted in *The Collective Memory Reader*. Edited by Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, 84-90. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Dvinge, Anne. "Keeping Time, Performing Place: Jazz Heterotopia in Candace Allen's Valaida." *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 4, no. 2 (2012):1-19.

Eco, Umberto. *The Role of Reader: Explorations on the Semiotics of Texts*. London: Hutchinson, 1981.

Edelman , Diana Vikander., and Ehud Ben Zvi. Eds. *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Eichrodt, Walther. *Ezekiel: A Commentary.* Translated by Cosslett Quinn. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.

Elden, Stuart. *Mapping the Present: Heidegger, Foucault and the Project of a Spatial History*. London and New York: Continuum, 2001.

---------. *Understanding Henri Lefebvre: Theory and the Possible*. London, New York: Continuum, 2004.

Ellens, Deborah L. Michael H. Floyd, Wonil Kim, Marvin A. Sweeney. Eds. *Reading the Hebrew Bible for a New Millennium: Form, Concept, and Theological Perspective.* Vol. 2. Studies in Antiquity & Christianity. New York: Bloomsbury, 2001.

Feldt, Laura. "A Walk on the Wild Side with Yahweh: A Spatial Perspective on the Hebrew Deity in the National Epic." *SJOT* 28, no. 2 (2014): 185-211.

Fewell, Danna Nolan. Ed. *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.

Fish, Stanly. *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, MS: Harvard Univ. Press, 1980.

Fishbane, Michael. *Haftarot*. JPS Bible Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002.

---------. "Sin and Judgment in the Prophecies of Ezekiel." *Interpretation* 38 (1984): 131-50.

Flanagan, James W. "Ancient Perception of Space/Perceptions of Ancient Space." *Semeia* 87 (1999): 15-43.

Fohrer, Georg. *Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel.* BZAW 72. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1952.

---------, Hans Werner Hoffmann, Friedrich Huber, et.al. *Exegese des Alten Testaments: Einführung in die Methodik.* 5th edition. UTB 267. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1983.

---------, and Kurt Galling. *Ezechiel.* Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955.

---------. *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie.* BZAW 99. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan

---------. "Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias." In *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*. Ed. Neil Leach, 330-36. NYC: Routledge, 1997.

---------. "Of Other Spaces." *Diacritics: A Review of Contemporary Criticism* 16, no. 1 (1986): 22-27.

---------. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage Books, 1973.

---------. 'Préface' in *Les mots et les choses*, Paris: Éditions Gallimard. 1966. English Title: Foucault. 'Preface' in *The Order of Things*. Andover, Hants: Tavistock, 1970.

Fox, Michael V. "Rhetoric of Ezekiel's Vision of the Valley of the Bones." *HUCA* 51 (1980): 1-15.

Frenbug, Brandon. *Ezekiel.* The College Press. NIV Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 2002.

Friedman, Norman. "Point of View in Fiction: The Development of a Critical Concept." *PMLA* 70, no. 5 (1955): 108-37.

Garber, David G. Jr. "Traumatizing Ezekiel, the Exilic Prophet." In *Psychology and the Bible: A New Way to Read the Scriptures, From Genesis to Apocalyptic Vision.* Vol. 2. Praeger Perspectives: Psychology, Religion, and Spirituality. Edited by J. Harold Ellens and Wayne G. Rollins, 215-35. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004.

Garscha, Jörg. *Studien zum Ezechielbuch. Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung von 1-39.* Frankfurt am Mein: Herbert Lang, 1974.

Gaster, Theodore H. "Ezekiel and the Mysteries." *JBL* 60 (1941): 289-310.

Genette, Gérard, and Ann Levonas. "Boundaries of Narrative." *New Literary History.* 8, no. 1 (1976): 1-13.

--------.   *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method.* Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell Univ. Press, 1980.

--------. *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1988.

Genocchio, Benjamin. "Discourse, Discontinuity, Difference: The Question of 'Other' Spaces'." In *Postmodern Cities and Spaces*. Edited by Sophie Watson and Katherine Gibson, 35-46. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.

Gerrig, Richard J. "A Moment-by Moment Perspective on Readers' Experiences of Characters." In *Characters in Fictional Worlds Understanding Imaginary Beings in Literature, Film, and Other Media.* Edited by Jens Eder, Fotis Jannidis, and Ralf Schneider, 357-76. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.

Gesenius, Wilhelm, Emil Friedrich Kautzsch, and A. E. Cowley. Eds. *Hebrew Grammar*. 2nd English edition. Rev. in accordance with the 28th German edition (1909). Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.

Grabbe, Lester L. "Priest Is without Honor in His Own Prophet: Priests and Other Religious Specialists in the Latter Prophets." In *The Priests in the Prophets: The Portrayal of Priests, Prophets and Other Religious Specialists in the Latter Prophets.* Edited by Lester L. Grabbe and Alice Ogden Bellis, 79-97. JSOTSup 408. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Graffy, Adrian. *A Prophet Confronts His People. The Disputation Speech in the Prophet.* AnBib 104. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1984.

Greenberg, Moshe. E*zekiel 1-20*. New York: Anchor Bible, 1983.

--------. "Vision of Jerusalem in Ezekiel 8-11: A Holistic Interpretation." In *The Divine Helmsman: Studies on God's Control of Human Events, Fest. Lou H. Silberman*. Edited by J. L. Crenshaw and S. Sandmel, 143-63. New York: Ktav, 1980.

Greenhill, William, and James Sherman. *An Exposition of the Prophet Ezekiel, with Useful Observations Thereupon*. London: Samuel Holdsworth, 1839.

Gross, Carl D. "Ezekiel and Solomon's Temple." *The Bible Translator* 50, no. 2 (1999): 207-14.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*. Translated by Joachim Begrich. Mercer Library of Biblical Studies. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1939.

-------. "Die Israelitische Literatur." In *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*. Edited by Paul Hinneberg, 53-112. Berlin & Leipzig, 1906.

-------. *The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga and History*. Translated by William Herbert Carruth. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.

Gunn, David M. and P. M. McNutt. Eds. *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social, and Historical Constructs in Honor or James W. Flanagan*. JSOTSup 359. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2002.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *The Collective Memory*. New York: Harper & Row, 1980.

Halperin, David J. "The Exegetical Character of Ezek. X 9-17." *VT* 26, no. 2 (1976): 129-41.

-------. *Seeking Ezekiel: Text and Psychology*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993.

--------. "Seeking Ezekiel." In *Peace and Justice Shall Embrace: Power and Theopolitics in the Bible: Essays in Honor of Millard Lind.* Edited by Ted Grimsrud and Loren L. Johns, 108-44. Telford, PA: Pandora, 1999.

Haran, Menahem. "Ezekiel, P, and the Priestly School." *VT* 58 (2008): 211-18.

---------. "The Law-Code of Ezekiel XL-XLVIII and Its Relation to the Priestly School." *HUCA* 50 (1979): 45-71.

-------. *Temples and temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.

---------. *Spaces of Hope.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Hatina, Thomas. *In Searching of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2002.

Hauser, Gerard A. *Introduction to Rhetorical Theory: Second Edition*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2012.

Häusl, Maria. "Jerusalem, the Holy City: The Meaning of the City of Jerusalem in the Books of Ezra-Nehemiah." In *Constructions of Space V: Place, Space and Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Edited by Gert T. M. Prinsloo and Christl M. Maier, 87-106. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Haynes, Stephen R., and Steven L. McKenzie. Eds. *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Applications.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990.

Hays, John H. *Old Testament Form criticism.* Trinity University Monograph Series in Religion. Vol. 2. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974.

Heim, Knut M. "The Perfect King of Psalm 72: An Intertextual Enquiry." In *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic texts*. Edited by P. E. Satterthwaite, R. S. Hess, and G. J. Wenham, 223-48. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995.

Hermann, Johannes. *Ezechielstudien*. Leipzig: Keichert, 1908.

Herntrich, Volkmar. *Ezechielprobleme*. BZAW 61. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1932.

Herring, Stephen L. *Divine Substitution: Humanity as the Manifestation of Deity in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient near East*. FRLANT 247. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

Hiebel, Janina Maria. *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives: A Redaction-Critical and Theological Study*. BZAW 475. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015.

Hjelm, Ingrid. *Jerusalem's Rise of Sovereignty: Zion and Gerizim in Competition*. JSOTSup 359. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2004.

Hogan, Patrick Colm. *Narrative Discourse: Authors and Narrators in Literature, Film, and Art*. Ohio: The Ohio State University, 2013.

Holladay, William. L. "Had Ezekiel Known Jeremiah Personally?" *CBQ* 63 (2001): 31-34.

Hölscher, Gustav. *Hesekiel, der Dichter und das Buch: eine literarkritische Untersuchung*. BZAW 39. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1924.

Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar. "Die Tempelvision Ez 8-11 im Licht unterschiedlicher methodischer Zugänge." In *Ezekiel and His Book. Textual and Literary Criticism and their Interrelation*. Edited by Johan Lust, 151-65. BETL 74; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986.

-------. "Probleme einer 'ganzheitlichen Lektüre' der Schrift. Dargestellt am Beispiel Ez 9-10." *TQ* 167 (1987): 266-77.

Houk, Cornelius B. "The Final Redaction of Ezekiel 10." *JBL* 90 (1971): 42-54.

House, Paul R. *Zephaniah: A Prophetic Drama*. Bible and Literature Series 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.

Howie, Carl. G. *The Date and Composition of Ezekiel*. SBLMS 4. Philadelphia: SBL, 1950.

Huyssen, Andreas. *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1978.

-------. "Indeterminacy and the Reader's Response." In *Aspects of Narrative: Selected Papers from the English Institute*. Edited by J. H. Miller, 1-45. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.

Jacobus, Melancthon, W. Edward E. Nourse, and Andrew C. Zenos. Eds. *A Standard Bible Dictionary: Designed as a Comprehensive Guide to The Scriptures, Embracing Their Languages, Literature, History, Biography, Manners and Customs, and Their Theology.* New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1909.

Jahn, Manfred. *Narratology: A Guide to the Theory of Narrative*. University of Cologne, 2005. Retrieved from http://www.uni-koeln.de/~ame02/pppn.htm

Jaspers, Karl. "Der Prophet Ezechiel: Eine pathgraphische Studie." In *Arbeiten zur Psychiatrie, Neurologie und ihren Grenzbebieten: Festschrift für K. Schneider*. Edited by H. Kranz, 77-85. Heidelberg: L. Schneider, 1947.

Joyce, Paul M. *Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel*. LHB/OT. JSOTSup 51. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.

-------. *Ezekiel: A Commentary*. LHB/OTS 482. New York/London: T & T Clark, 2007.

-------. "Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives on Ezekiel." In *Synchronic or Diachronic?: A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis*. Edited by Johannes Cornelius De Moor, 115-28. SOTS. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Katz, Ben Zion. "The Pentateuch Quoted Intact: Evidence from Ezekiel and Psalms." *JBQ* 43, no. 4 (2015): 256-62.

Keck, Elizabeth. "The Glory of Yahweh, Name Theology, and Ezekiel's Understanding of Divine Presence." Ph.D. diss. Boston College, 2011

Kellman, Steven G. *The Self Begetting Novel*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Kim, Soo J. "Ashamed before the Presence of God." Paper presented at the annual meeting of Society of Biblical Literature, Baltimore, Maryland, November, 2013.

-------."Was Ezekiel a Messenger? A Manager? Or a Moving Sanctuary? A Beckettian Reading of the Book of Ezekiel in the Inquiry of the Divine Presence." Paper presented at the annual meeting of Society of Biblical Literature in Atlanta, GA, November, 2015.

-------. "YHWH Shammah: The City as Gateway to the Presence of YHWH." *JSOT* 39.2 (2014): 187-207.

Klein, Anja. "Prophecy Continued: Reflections on Innerbibical Exegesis in the Book of Ezekiel." *VT* 60 (2010): 571-82.

-------. *Schriftauslegung im Ezechielbuch. Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Ez 34-39*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Knierim, Rolf P. *Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered*. Occasional papers: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity 6. Claremont, CA: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, 1980.

-------. *Text and Concept in Leviticus 1:1-9: A Case in Exegetical Method,* FAT 2. Tübingen: Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1992.

Knight, Douglas A. "Traditio-Historical Criticism: The Development of the Covenant Code." In *Method Matters: Essays on the Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David L. Petersen*. Edited by Joel M. LeMon and Kent Harold Richards, 97-116. Atlanta: SBL, 2009.

Knight, Kevin. "Real Places and Impossible Spaces: Foucault's Heterotopia in the Fiction of James Joyce, Vladimir Nabokov, and W.G. Sebald." Ph. D. Thesis: University of East Anglia, 2014.

Knowles, Melody D. *Centrality Practiced: Jerusalem in the Religious Practice of Yehud and the Diaspora during the Persian Period*. SBLABS 16. Atlanta: SBL, 2006.

Koch, Klaus. *Was Ist Formgeschichte: Neue Wege der Bibelexegese*. Berlin: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1967.

Koehler, Ludwig. Walter Baumgartner, Johann Jakob Stamm, Benedikt Hartmann, Ze'Ev Ben-Hayyim, Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Kohn, Margaret. "The Power of Place: The House of the People as Counterpublic." *Polity* 33, no. 4 (2001): 503-26.

Kohn, Risa Levitt. "Ezekiel, the Exile, and the Torah." In *SBL 1999 Seminar Papers*, 501-26. SBLSP 38. Atlanta: SBL, 1999.

-------. *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, The Exile and the Torah*. JSOTSup 358, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

-------. "A Prophet Like Moses? Rethinking Ezekiel's Relationship to the Torah." *ZAW* 114 (2002): 236-54.

Kozloff, Sarah. *Invisible Storytellers*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Edited by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Kundera, Milan *The Book of Laughter and Forgetting*. Translated by Aaron Asher. New York: Perennial Classics, 1999.

Kutsko, John F. *Between Heaven and Earth: Divine Presence and Absence in the Book of Ezekiel*. Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego 7 .Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

Laban, Antje. "Metaphor and Intertextuality: 'Daughter of Zion' as a Test Case." *SJOT* 17 (2003): 49-67.

Lapsley, Jacqueline. *Can These Bones Live: The Problem of the Moral Self in the Book of Ezekiel*. BZAW 301. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000.

Launderville, Dale. *Spirit and Reason: The Embodied Character of Ezekiel's Symbolic Thinking*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.

-------. "The Threat of Syncretism to Ezekiel's Exilic Audience in the Dry Bones Passage." *Die Welt des Orients.* vol. 45, no. 1 (2015): 38-49.

Lee, Won W. *Punishment and Forgiveness in Israel's Migratory Campaign*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space.* Translated by D. Nicholson-Smith. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1991.

--------. *Writings on Cities*. Translated by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas. Maleden, MA: Blackwell, 1996.

Leonard, Jeffery. "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case." *JBL* 127, no. 2 (2008): 241-65.

Levenson, Jon D. *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48*, HSM 10. Missoula: Scholars, 1976.

Lindblom, Johannes. *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962.

Lust, Johan. "The Final Text and Textual Criticism: Ez 39, 28." In *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and their Interrelation*. Edited by Johan Lust, 48-54. BETL 74. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.

Lyons, Michael. *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code*. LHB/OTS 507. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.

Maier, Christl M. *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion: Gender, Space, and the Sacred in Ancient Israel.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.

--------. "Whose Mother? Whose Space? Jerusalem in Third Isaiah." In *Constructions of Space V: Place, Space and Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Edited by Gert T. M. Prinsloo and Christl M. Maier, 107-24. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Mandolfo, Carleen. "Dialogic Form Criticism: An Intertextual Reading of Lamentations and Psalms of Lament." In *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies*. Edited by Roland Boer, 69-90. Atlanta: SBL, 2007.

Matties, Gordon H. *Ezekiel 18 and the Rhetoric of Moral Discourse*. SBLDS 126. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Mayfield, Tyler D. *Literary Structure and Setting in Ezekiel*, FAT 2. 43. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

McEntire, Mark. *A Chorus of Prophetic Voices: Introducing the Prophetic Literature of Ancient Israel*. Louisville, KY: John Knox, 2015.

McKeating, Henry. "Ezekiel the 'Prophet Like Moses'?." *JSOT* 61 (1994): 97–109.

McNutt, M. Paula. "'Fathers of the Empty Spaces' and 'Strangers Forever': Social Marginality and the Construction of Space." In *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan*. Edited by Gunn David M. and Paula M. McNutt, 30-50. JSOTSup 359. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Meindl, Dieter. "(Un-)Reliable Narration from a Pronominal Perspective." In *The Dynamics of Narrative form: Studies in Anglo-American Narratology*. Edited by John Pier, 59-82. Narratologia. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.

Melugin, Roy F. "Recent Form criticism Revisited in an Age of Reader Response." In *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the twenty-first century.* Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Marvin A. Sweeney, 46-64. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Milgrom, Jacob. *Ezekiel's Hope: A Commentary on Ezekiel 38-48*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2012.

Mills, Mary E. *Urban Imagination in Biblical Prophecy*. New York: T&T Clark International, 2012.

Moore, Lauren A. S. *Josiah's Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Mroczek, Eva. "How Not to Build a Temple: Jacob, David, and the Unbuilt Ideal in Ancient Judaism." *JSJ* 46 (2015): 1-35.

Muilenburg, James. "Form Criticism and Beyond." *JBL* 88, no. 1 (1969): 1-18.

Muller, Reinhard, R. B. ter Haar Romeny, and Juha Pakkala. "From Small Additions to Rewriting in the Story about the Burning of Jerusalem." In *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible,* 109-26. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.

Nasuti, Harry Peter. *Defining the Sacred Songs: Genre, Tradition, and the Post-Critical Interpretation of the Psalms.* JSOTSup 218. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Neher, André. "Ezéchiel, rédempteur de Sodome." *RHPR* 59 (1979): 483-90.

Nelson, Richard D. *Raising up a faithful priest: Community and Priesthood in Biblical Theology.* Louisville: Westminster/ John Knox, 1993.

Newsom, Carol A. *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imagination*. New York: Oxford University, 2003.

Nielsen, Henrik Skov. "The Impersonal Voice of First-Person Narrative Fiction." *Narrative* 12, no. 2 (2004): 133-50.

Nielsen, Kirsten. "Intertextuality and Hebrew Bible." *VT* Sup 80 (2000) 17-31.

Nietzsche, Frederich. *Untimely Mediations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Nissinen, Marttiti "(How) Does the Book of Ezekiel Reveal Its Babylonian Context?" *Die Welt des Orients* 45 (2015): 85-98.

Noth, Martin. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions.* Translated by Bernhard W. Anderson. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Oded, Bustenay. "'Yet I Have Been to Them מעט למקדש in the Countries Where They Have Gone' (Ezekiel 11:16)." In *Sefer Moshe: The Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume. Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism.* Edited by C. Cohen, A. Hurvitz, S. M. Paul, 103-14. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004.

Odell, Margaret S. "The City of Hamonah in Ezekiel 39:11-16: The Tumultuous City of Jerusalem." *CBQ* 56, no. 3 (1994): 479-89.

--------. "Ezekiel Saw What He Said He Saw: Genres, Forms, and the Vision of Ezekiel 1." In *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the twenty-first century.* Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Marvin A. Sweeney, 162-76. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

-------. "Genre and Persona in Ezekiel 24:15-24." In *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong, 195-219. SBLSymS 9. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.

--------. "What Was the Image of Jealousy in Ezekiel 8?" In *The Priests in the Prophets. The Portrayal of Priests, Prophets and Other Religious Specialists in the Latter Prophets*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe and Alice Ogden Bellis, 134-48. JSOTSup 408. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Pakkala, Juha. *God's Word Omitted: Omissions in the Transmission of the Hebrew Bible*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

Pasco, Allan H. *Allusion: A Literary Graft*. Emf Reprints. Toronto: Rookwood Press, 2002.

Pausch, Dennis. "Libellus non tam diserte quam fideliter scriptus? Unreliable Narration in the Historia Augusta." *Ancient Narrative* 8 (2010): 115-35.

Peterson, Brian N. *Ezekiel in Context: Ezekiel's Message Understood in Its Historical Setting of Covenant Curses and Ancient Near Eastern Mythological Motifs*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 182. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012.

Petter, Donna Lee. *The Book of Ezekiel and Mesopotamian City Laments*. OBO 246. Fribourg: Academic Press, 2011.

Phelan, James. *Living to Tell About It: A Rhetoric and Ethics of Character Narration*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005.

-------, and Peter J. Rabinowitz. *A Companion to Narrative Theory*, Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture 54. Oxford: Wiley, 2005.

-------. "Why Narrators Can be Focalizers—and Why it Matters." In *New Perspectives on Narrative Perspective*. Edited by W. van Peer & S. Chatman, 51-64. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.

Pohlmann, Karl-Friedrich and Thilo Alexander Rudnig. *Das Buch des Propheten Hesekiel (Ezechiel) / Ü bersetzt und erklärt von Karl-Friedrich Pohlmann.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

--------. *Ezechielstudien. Zur redaktionsgeschichte des Buches und zur Frage nach den ältesten Texten*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992.

Pratico, Gary D. and Miles V. Van Pelt. *Basics of Biblical Hebrew: Grammar*. 2nd edition. Zondervan, 2007.

Prince, Gerald. *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982.

Rabinowitz, Peter. "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences." *Critical Inquiry* 4, no. 1 (1977): 121-41.

Raitt, Thomas M. *A Theology of Exile: Judgment/Deliverance in Jeremiah and Ezekiel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

Reed, Jeffery T. "Discourse Analysis as New Testament Hermeneutic: A Retrospective and Prospective Appraisal." *JETS* 39, no. 2 (1996): 223-40.

-------. *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate Over Literary Integrity*. JSNTSup. 136. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

Rendtorff, Rolf. *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*. JSOTSup 89. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

Renz, Thomas. *The Rhetorical Function of the book of Ezekiel.* VTSup 76. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Richardson, Brian. "Singular Text, Multiple Implied Readers." *Style* 41, no. 3 (2007): 259-74.

Richter, Wolfgang. *Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft: Entwurf Einer Alttestamentlichen Literaturtheorie Und Methodolgie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.

Rickard, John S. *Joyce's Book of Memory: The Mnemotechnic of Ulysses*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1999

Ridderbos, Herman. "The Structure and Scope of the Prologue to the Gospel of John." In *Placita Pleiadia, Opstellen aangeboden aan Prof. Dr. G. Sevenster*. Leiden: Brill, 1966; Also published in *Novum Testamentum* 8 (1966): 180-201.

Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London: Methuen, 2002.

-------. "Wolfgang Iser — in Memoriam." *Partial Answers: Journal of Literature and the History of Ideas* 5, no. 2 (2007): 141-44.

Robson, James. *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*. New York: T&T Clark International, 2006.

Rom-Shiloni, Dalit. *Exclusive Inclusivity: Identity Conflicts between the Exiles and the People Who Remained (6th-5th Centuries BCE)*. LHB/OTS. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013.

--------. "Jerusalem and Israel, Synonyms or Antonyms? Jewish Exegesis of Ezekiel's Prophecies against Jerusalem." In *After Ezekiel: Essays on the Reception of a Difficult Prophet*. Edited by Andrew Mein and Paul Joyce, 89-114. London & New York: T&T Clark, 2010.

Römer, Thomas. "The Current Discussion on the so-called Deuteronomistic History: Literary Criticism and Theological Consequences." *Humanities: Christianity and Culture* 46 (2015): 43-66.

-------. "Form Criticism and So Called Deuteronomistic History." In *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-first Century.* Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Marvin A. Sweeny, 240-52. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Said, Edward W. *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Sailhamer, John H. *Introduction to Old Testament Theology: A Canonical Approach*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.

Scheuer, Blaženka. *The Return of YHWH: The Tension between Deliverance and Repentance in Isaiah 40-55*. BZAW 377. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Schweizer, Harald. *Metaphorische Grammatik: Wege Zur Integration Von Grammatik Und Textinterpretation in Der Exegese.* ATSAT 15. Bd St. Ottilien: EOS-Verlag, 1981.

Shang, Biwu. *In Pursuit of Narrative Dynamics: A Study of James Phelan's Rhetorical Theory of Narrative*. Europäische Hochschulschriften 463. New York: Peter Lang, 2011.

Shupak, Nili. "'Eat This Scroll' (Ezekiel 3:1): Writing as Symbol and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Sources." *BiOr* 70 (2013): 26-42.

Smith-Christopher, Daniel L. "Reassessing the Historical and Sociological Impact of the Babylonian Exile (597/587-539 BCE)." In *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Conceptions*. Edited by James M. Scott, 7-36. JSJSup 56. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Smith, James. *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: A New Introduction*. New York: Macmillan, 1931.

Sohn, Heidi. "Heterotopia: Anamnesis of a Medical Term." in *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a Postcivil Society*. Edited by Michiel Dehaene and Lieven de Cauter, 41-50. London: Routledge, 2007.

Soja, Edward. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*, London: Verso, 1989.

-------. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1996.

Sommer, Benjamin D. *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Stackert, Jeffrey. *A Prophet Like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion*. New York: Oxford University, 2014.

-------. *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness legislation*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Stanzel, Franz K. *Narrative Situations in the Novel: Tom Jones, Moby-Dick, The Ambassadors, Ulysses*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971.

-------. *A Theory of Narrative.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Stevenson, Kalinda Rose. *Vision of Transformation: The Territorial Rhetoric of Ezekiel 40-48*. SBLDS 154. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996.

Strine, Casey. A. *Sworn Enemies: The Divine Oath, the Book of Ezekiel, and the Polemics of Exile.* BZAW 436. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013.

Strong, John T. "The God that Ezekiel Inherited." In *The God Ezekiel Creates*. Edited by Paul M. Joyce and Dalit Rom-Shiloni, 24-54. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, an imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2015.

-------. "Grounding Ezekiel's Heavenly Ascent: A Defense of Ezek 40-48." *SJOT* 26, no. 2 (2021): 192-211.

Stubbs, Michael. *Discourse Analysis: Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Sweeney, Marvin A. "Concerning the Structure and Generic Character of the Book of Nahum." *ZAW* 104 (1992): 364-77.

-------, and Ehud Ben Zvi. Edited. *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

-------. *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature,* FAT 45. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. 2005.

-------. "Formation and Form in Prophetic Literature." In *Old Testament Interpretation: Past Present, and Future: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker*. Edited by James Luther Mays, David L. Petersen and Kent Harold Richards, 113-26. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.

-------. "A Form-Critical Reassessment of the Book of Zephaniah." *CBQ* 53 (1991): 388-408.

-------. "A Form-Critical Reading of Hosea." *JHebS* 2 (1998):1-16.

-------. "Form Criticism." In *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Applications. Rev. and Expanded*. Edited by Stephen R. Haynes, and Steven L. McKenzie, 58-89. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999.

-------. *Isaiah 1-39: With an Introduction to Prophetic Literature*. FOTL 16. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

-------. "Isaiah 60-62 in Intertextual Perspective." Paper presented at the annual meeting for the Society of Biblical Literature (National Association of Professors of Hebrew Seminar) in San Diego CA, November 22-24, 2014.

-------. *Reading Ezekiel: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2013.

-------. *Reading Prophetic Books: Form, Intertextuality, and Reception in Prophetic and Post-Biblical Literature*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

-------. "Structure, Genre, and Intent in the Book of Habakkuk." *VT* 41 (1991): 63-83.

-------. *Tanak: A Theological and Critical Introduction to the Jewish Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

Tegla, Emanuela. *J. M. Coetzee and the Ethics of Power: Unsettling Complicity, and Confession*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Todorov, Tzvetan. "The Categories of Literary Narrative." *Paper on Language & Literature.* 16, no. 1 (1980): 3-36.

Tooman, William A. *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38-39*. FAT II/52. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Torrey, Charles C. *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy*. Yale Oriented Series 18. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930.

Trible, Phyllis. *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah.* Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Old Testament Series. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

Troxel, Ronald L. *Prophetic Literature: From Oracles to Books*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience.* 6ᵗʰ printing. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.

Tulving, Endel. *Elements of Episodic Memory*. Oxford Psychology Series 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983.

Turner, Nicolas. *Handbook for Biblical Studies*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1982.

Uehlinger, Christoph and Susanne Muller Trufaut. "Ezekiel 1, Babylonian Cosmological Scholarship and Iconography: Attempts at Further Refinement." *TZ* 57 (2001): 147-71.

-------. "Virtual Vision vs. Actual Show: Strategies of Visualization in the Book of Ezekiel." *Die Welt des Orients.* 45, no. 1 (2015): 62-84.

Vanderhooft, David S. "Chebar," *EBR* 5 (2012): 46.

Vawter, Bruce and Leslie J. Hoppe. *A New Heart: A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991

Vogt, Ernst. *Untersuchungen Zum Buch Ezechiel.* AnBib 95. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981.

Von Rad, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper, 1962.

-------. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays.* Translated by E. W. Trueman- Dicken. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996.

Watts, James. "The Rhetoric of Sacrifice." In *Ritual and Metaphor: Sacrifice in the Bible*. Edited by Christian A. Eberhart, 3-16. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.

Westermann, Claus. *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.

Wevers, John W. *Ezekiel*, NCB. London: Nelson, 1969.

Whitlinger, Claire. "From Countermemory to Collective Memory: Acknowledging the 'Mississippi Burning' Murders." *Sociological Forum* 30 (2015): 648-70.

Wildberger, Hans. "Israel und sein Land." *EvTh* 16 (1956): 404-22.

-------. *Jesaja (Jesaja 1-12)*. Biblicshcer Kkommentar Altes Testament X/1. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1972.

Wolff, Hans. W. "Die eigentliche Botschaft der klassischen Propheten." In *Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie, Festschritt W.Zimmerli*. Edited by Herbert Donner, Robert Hanhart and Rudolf Smend, 547-57. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1977.

Wong, Ka Leung. "A Note on Ezekiel VIII 6." *VT* 51, no. 3 (2001): 396-400.

Wright, Jacob L. "Urbicide: The Ritualized Killing of Cities in the Ancient Near East." In *Ritual Violence in the Hebrew Bible: New Perspectives*. Edited by Saul M. Olyan,147-66. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Yamasaki, Gary. *Watching a Biblical Narrative: Point of View in Biblical Exegesis*. New York: T & T Clark, 2007.

Zimmerli, Walther. *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 1-24*. Translated by Ronald E. Clements. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Klaus Baltzer with the assistance of Leonard Jay Greenspoon. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

-------. *The Fiery Throne: The Prophets and Old Testament Theology*, Fortress Classics in Biblical Studies. Philadelphia: Fortress, 2003.

-------. *Old Testament Theology in Outline.* Translated by David E. Green. Edinburgh , Scotland: John Knox Press, 1978.

-------. "Special Form-and Traditio-historical Character of Ezekiel's Prophecy." *VT* 15 (1965): 515-27.

Ziva, Ben-Porat. "The Poetics of Literary Allusion." *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1 (1976): 105-28.